

# The Classical Review

MARCH 1902.

THE selection of London as the place of meeting for the National Academies in 1904, will have been a fortunate circumstance for classical studies in this country if it lead to the creation of an organisation which will have their interests as those of other at present unrecognised studies officially in its charge. Our readers are doubtless aware of the three petitions recently presented to the King, the first from a number of eminent philosophers, scholars, and historians praying for their incorporation as a British Academy, another from the Council of the Royal Society supporting this prayer, and a third one, in point of time prior to the second, which urged that the objects of the first petition would be best attained not by a separate institution but by one in connexion with the existing Royal Society. The latter proposal appears to have decided advantages. *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*; and as a branch of the Royal Society the new institution would succeed at once to the possession of the two things most vital to future usefulness—a recognised standard and an admitted prestige.

We have received from Dr. Daniel Quinn a copy of his article on the Language Question in Greece which forms Chapter XXIII. and pages 1297-1319 in the Report of the United States Bureau of Education for 1899-1900. It may be recommended to the notice of foreigners who wish to appreciate more exactly the issues in the question now distracting Greece. In a historical survey which starts with the popular dialect in old Attic, as revealed to us by the

researches of Paul Kretschmer from the inscriptions upon ancient vases, and comes down to the most recent times, Dr. Quinn shows that bilingualism or, as he calls it, 'diglossy' is no new thing in the history of Greece. Among the forms of Greek linguistic development which are passed under review are the Homeric 'Kunstdialekt,' the *koiné*, the new Attic of the 'Atticists' and the mixture of the *koiné* and the popular idiom of the day in which Ioannes Malalas of Antioch composed his Chronicle. The struggle for predominance between the literary language and the 'demotic,' the modern popular Greek, which first made its appearance in literature in the twelfth century, although of course much older, is not a new one. 'From the beginning of the sixteenth century down to the beginning of the nineteenth, there were three phases of language struggling for the future mastery in literature, the old Koene, the demotic in the form of local dialects chiefly, and a mixed variety which accepted very much from the demotic and discarded very much that was peculiar to the old language, as for instance the use of infinitives and optatives and datives, but which nevertheless retained in general the ancient grammatical types.' Towards the beginning of the present century the claims of ancient Greek or, at least, what we may call ancient ecclesiastical Greek were supported by men of high and wide repute at that time, such as Lampros Photiades, Stephanos Kommetas, and Neophytos Doukas. The claims of the demotic to be the sole national language were advocated by Katarztes, a forgotten writer in

prose and two poets Billaras and Christopoulos who have still a vogue. Entirely new life and interest, says Dr. Quinn, was given to the dispute by the deep scholarship and patriotic labours of Adamantios Korais whose views were first made public in 1804. His object was to keep as close as possible to the demotic which he would purify by weeding out of it foreign discordant elements such as Turkish and Albanian words. This purified demotic was known as the *Katharevousa*, now the recognised name of the official language of Greece. Passing to the present day he distinguishes three grades of the *Katharevousa*: that used by the 'austere purists,' like the poet Kleon Rangabes in his *Ἀλγῆ* (Leipzig 1893), the 'temperate' form in which is written the largest part of the better contemporary literature, and the least rigid form, used for example by Bikelas in his translation of Shakespeare. Amongst the supporters of demotic pure and simple may be mentioned Professors

Psycharis and Émile Legrand of Paris, the poets Polemas and Mashoras and the novelist Andreas Karkobitsas. Dr. Quinn writes moderately and temperately of these rival claimants; but his own sympathies appear to be with some form of the *Katharevousa*.

A welcome sign of the vivid interest of Modern Greece in Ancient is the appearance of Part I. of a Modern Greek counterpart of Liddell and Scott, a work which the editor, M. Anestes Constantinides, eulogises in terms that would have rejoiced the hearts of the two scholars to whom we owe so much. The first instalment takes us down to the very beginning of B; 462 pages are devoted to A as against 269 in the model; but difference of type accounts for the greater part of the excess. We hope to publish a more detailed account in a future issue.

#### A NEGLECTED MS. OF PLATO.

UNDER Cobet's influence the great Paris MS. (A) was long regarded as the sole authority for the last three tetralogies of Plato, just as the Clarke MS. at Oxford (B) was supposed to be the sole authority for the three first. 'Vile damnum,' he says of the rest, 'si omnes ad unum flammis comburentur.' Little by little, editors have retreated from this extreme position. Schanz has shown that D (Venetus 185, Bekker's II) is independent of A in the *Republic*. It represents for us, as Jordan suggests, the missing second volume of B, just as T (Venetus App. class. 4. cod. 1) represents for us the missing first volume of A. Still more recently, Professor Lewis Campbell has shown that the Cesena MS., which he calls M, is independent of A as well as of D. We thus possess three independent witnesses, and on these three Professor Campbell's text of the *Republic* is mainly based.

It can hardly be said, however, that these three MSS. represent three, or even two, families in the strict sense. They are all clearly derived from a single archetype, and give substantially the same recension of the text. In particular M is very closely related to A, and there is every reason to believe that the original of ADM was not

very much older than A itself. It is clear, therefore, that the text of the *Republic* will rest on a much surer foundation if it can be shown that there exists a tradition wholly independent of ADM.

The Hofbibliothek at Vienna has proved the Nemesis of nineteenth century Platonic criticism. Its MSS. are very imperfectly represented in Bekker's apparatus, and most scholars have formed their views independently of them. The bitterness caused by the appearance on the scene of the MS. now known as W would be amusing if it were not so unedifying. Even Schanz has been a good deal less than fair to Král's perfectly honest and well-meant examination of this MS. It is, therefore, with some fear that I venture to claim an even higher place in the Platonic apparatus for another Vienna MS., of which a full collation has been in the hands of scholars for three-quarters of a century. I can only explain its neglect by the fact that it is in Schneider's apparatus and not in Bekker's, beyond which few scholars care to travel. Mr. Adam (who knows the value of Schneider) would certainly have discovered the truth if he had for a moment abandoned his generally prudent and healthy scepticism as to theories of manuscript affiliation. In

the preface to his text of the *Republic*, he says (p. xii. n. 3) 'the general result—that where A is wrong, *v* is right oftener than any other single MS. except II,  $\Xi$  and *q*—is, I believe, firmly established.' So far as Bekker's MSS. go, this is probably true; but *v* (Schneider's Ang.) is demonstrably derived from Vind. F, which is, at the very least, two centuries older, and should, therefore, get all the credit in these cases. I may add, in passing, that Stallbaum's *x* (Schneider's Flor. R), to which some editors have paid considerable attention, is also derived from Vind. F.

With regard to Vind. F itself, I believe I can show (1) that it is derived, mediately or immediately, from an archetype of greater

antiquity than any extant Platonic MS., (2) that its archetype was independent of that of ADM.

(1) The antiquity of its archetype is proved by the nature of the graphic errors in F. These are mostly of such a kind that they could hardly have arisen in the process of transcribing an original written in minuscule characters, while many of them must have arisen from the misreading of a manuscript written in majuscules. The following list is far from exhaustive, but it is sufficient to prove the point, and may also have some interest as a fairly representative table of the sort of errors to be expected in such cases. It will be seen that *vx* correct the most obvious mistakes.

## ADM

- St. 330e δειμαίνει  
339b μεγάλη  
349b εὐήθησ  
351b γε ἡ ἀρίστη  
353a ἡρώτων  
  
358c αὐτὸ οἱ  
" ἀναγκαῖον  
359a δὴ ἄρξασθαι  
363a ὁσίοισ  
367a ἴσωσ  
371b μεταδώσουσιν ὦν  
394e ἡ οὐ  
398d αἰδομένον (AM)  
399c νῦν δὴ (AM)  
401a ἱκακοῦσθαι (AM)  
401c αὖρα (AM)  
404b μάλιστα ἡ  
405c λυγίζόμενος AM }  
λογιζόμενος D }  
420a οὐδ' ἀναλίσκειν  
449a ἦρα  
450a τισ ἐάσοι  
451b γέλασας  
460d ἐκπορίζοντες  
467b οὕτω κίνδυνος  
487e δέ γε  
500d μόνον  
504d σπάνιον  
519e ἐγγενέσθαι  
520a ἐπὶ  
521d εἰη δ  
543c τε δεῖν  
576d ἀβλιότητος  
588c φύειν  
595c ῥητέον

## F

- ἀεὶ δειμαίνει (ἀεὶ δ. *v*: αἰεὶ δ. *x*)  
μέγα δὴ (corr. μεγάλη δὴ, and so *vx*)  
εὐ ποίεισ (ἐπικεύς corr. *v*)  
γ' ἐπαρίστω (not *vx*)  
πρώτων (corr. ἡρώτων int. vers.: ἡρώτων  
πρώτων *x*)  
αὐτόθι (corr. αὐτὸ and so *vx*)  
ἂν δίκαιον (not *vx*)  
ἀπάρξασθαι (so *vx*)  
θείοισ (δικαίοις *vx*, a conjecture)  
τέωσ (so *vx*)  
μεγάλως οὐσιῶν (not *vx*)  
ποῦ (not *vx*)  
διδόμενον (also D and so *x*)  
νῦν ἂν (also D, not *vx*)  
κακονοίας (also D, and *vx*)  
λύρα (also D, not *vx*)  
μάλιστ' ἂν (so *vx*)

## ΛΥ

- { αὐ λογιζόμενος, i.e. ΛΟΓΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΣ (so *vx*)  
οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν (corr. οὐδ' ἀναλίσκειν and so *vx*)  
ἦλα (corr. ἦρα (*sic*) and so *vx*)  
τισ θεάσοι (not *vx*)  
κλάσας (corr. γέλασας and so *vx*)  
σκορπίζοντες (not *vx*)  
οὕτως ἰνδυνος (not *vx*)  
λέγε (not *vx*)  
πόνον (not *vx*)  
ἐπανιόν (not *vx*)  
ἐπαινέσθαι (not *vx*)  
ἐν ἡ (not *vx*)  
εἶπω (not *vx*)  
τελείν (not *vx*)  
δολιότητος (δουλιότητος pr. *v*, a conjecture)  
φύσιν (not *vx*)  
ἡτέον (not *vx*)

(2) The original of Vind. F was not only older than our oldest MSS.; it was quite independent of the common archetype of ADM, and followed the recension used by

Galen, Iamblichus, Stobaeus, Clement, Eusebius, and other writers of the first five centuries after Christ. As I said in the Preface to the first volume of my edition of Plato, the agreement of W in peculiar readings with the old Armenian version on the one hand, and with Eusebius and Stobaeus on the other, is only to be explained on the theory that there was an 'ancient vulgate' of Plato's text, while our ninth century MSS. represent a recension made possibly about the fifth century A.D. The agreement between F and the 'indirect tradition' is even more striking, and extends even to small details. Considerable significance must be attached to the fact that in Rep. 612d the reading of F (vx) and Stobaeus *ἐπειδὴ τοῖνυν, ἣν δ' ἐγώ, κεκριμέναι εἰσι* is given in the margin of Par. A by the first hand with the sign γρ, while in the text A has *ἐπειδὴ ἣν τοῖνυν κεκριμέναι εἰσίν, ἐγώ* with

DM. In many places, F and the indirect tradition have alone preserved the true reading, e.g. 388e *ἐφίγ* F Stobaeus: *ἐφην* AM: *ἐφη* D, 620a *ὡσαύτως. εἰκόστην* F Plutarch; *ὡσαύτως εἰκόσ. τήν* ADM. In other places, again, F and the indirect tradition agree in manifest errors, 432a *οὕτω* AM: *ὅτι* D: *οὕτω τήν πόλιν* F Stobaeus, 534c *ἐξέγερσθαι* ADM: *ἐξεγρεῦσθαι* F, a reading only to be explained by contamination of the *ἐξαγρεῦσαι* found in the Farnesinus of Stobaeus with the true reading. It would be easy to multiply such instances, but it is better to take a single passage, Rep. ii 377c *Ἐν τοῖς μείζουσιν κ.τ.ε.*, which is transcribed as far as the end of the book by Eusebius (P.E. xiii. pp. 376-379), and several detached pieces of which are quoted elsewhere by the same author. The following variants are the most significant.

## ADM

- 377d καὶ πρῶτον  
378b δοκῶ  
οὐδὲ  
378c μέλλομεν  
λεκτέα μᾶλλον DM: μᾶλλον A  
378e ταῦτα AM: αὐτὰ D  
379a ὁ θεὸς ὦν  
379d δῶ ἀμφοτέρων  
380b λέγειν ταῦτα  
380c τοὺς λέγοντας  
381a ἀνδρειοτάτην  
ἔστι δὴ  
381b δῆλον ἔφη ὅτι  
381c θεῶ  
ἅπαντα  
381d πρωτίως  
381e ἡμῖν  
382a φάντασμα  
382b ἀγνοία ἢ τοῦ ἐψευσμένου  
382d ψευδὴς ἐν θεῶ  
ψευδοῖτο  
383c χρώμην

## F EUSEBIUS

- πρῶτόν τε (so vx)  
δοκεῖ (so vx)  
οὔτε (not vx)  
μέλλοιμεν (so vx)  
μᾶλλον λεκτέα (so vx)  
om. (so vx)  
ὦν ὁ θεὸς (so vx)  
ἀμφοτέρων δῶ (so vx)  
ταῦτα λέγειν (not vx?)  
τοὺς τε λέγοντας (so vx)  
ἀνδρειοτάτην τε (so vx)  
ἔστι (add. δὴ corr., and so vx)  
δηλονότι ἔφη (so vx)  
θεὸν (so vx)  
πᾶσα (so vx)  
πρωτίως τε (so vx)  
ἡμᾶς (so vx)  
φαντάσματα (so vx)  
τοῦ ἐψευσμένου ἀγνοία (so vx)  
ἐν θεῶ ψευδὴς (so vx)  
ἂν ψευδοῖτο (so vx)  
αὐτοῖς χρώμην (so vx)

It appears to me that these agreements and differences can only be explained on the theory I have advanced, and it would be easy to show in the same way the agreement of F with Iamblichus, Stobaeus and other writers, extending often even to minutiae like elision.<sup>1</sup> I claim, therefore,

<sup>1</sup> In his Index, Schneider had already pointed this out. He says of Vind. F 'Veterem vulgatam representat et fere cum Stobaeo, Eusebio, etc. consentit.' Being in the Index, this observation has been left unnoticed. I did not know of it myself till I had already worked out the problem. It shows

for Vind. F that it, along with the 'indirect tradition,' gives us a second foundation for the Platonic text, coordinate with the archetype of ADM. The manuscript is full of mistakes, no doubt; but they are not of the misleading kind, being due to ignorance and not to perverse ingenuity. Critically used, I believe its evidence to be of the highest value. If I am right, it follows, for instance, that the agreement of F with D will in

that the theory of an 'ancient vulgate' is not so modern as is sometimes supposed.



many cases outweigh the undoubted authority of A, even when supported by M, and that in many cases F is our oldest, and often our sole authority for the true reading. By assigning to it its due place in the *apparatus criticus*, we are able to dispense to a large extent with the Renaissance MSS.  $\Xi$  and  $\eta$  (which Mr. Adam ranks immediately after A and II), and this in itself is an appreciable gain. At the time these MSS. were written, conjectures were made in the most light-hearted way, and both of them come from the very centre of Platonic study. Ven.  $\Xi$  was written by Joannes Rhosus for Cardinal Bessarion, and Mon.  $\eta$  reveals its *provenance* in a marginal reference by the first hand to  $\delta$  θεός Πλήθων. Readings so attested have no more authority

than those of Ficinus and Cornarius, though it seems sometimes to be thought that the mere fact of their being written rather than printed gives them a superior claim to consideration. In point of fact, we can still see quite clearly from what originals these two MSS. were copied, and it is antecedently improbable that, where they depart from the earlier MSS. of their own family, they rest on anything better than conjecture. Of course, a few—a very few—of their conjectures are right, and they should be quoted for these, just as we quote Stephanus for his; but we are on much surer ground with an entirely unsophisticated document like Vind. F.

JOHN BURNET.

#### ARISTOPHANES, *KNIGHTS*, 532, 3.

DR. VERRALL'S notes on this play in the last number of this *Review* are most original and refreshing. The hard ground of the text cracks and out flies an *εμπιδοζων ισχαδās*. Whether his novelties are true is another question, and in one case I think his crusade against ancient and modern nonsense has carried him too far.

The traditional interpretation of vv. 531 sq., νυνὶ δ' ὑμεῖς αὐτὸν ὁρῶντες παραληροῦντ' οὐκ ἐλεεῖτε, | ἐκπιπτονσῶν τῶν ἤλεκτρων καὶ τοῦ τόνου οὐκ ἔτ' ἐνότος, | τῶν θ' ἁρμονιῶν διαχασκουσῶν ἀλλὰ γέρον ὦν περιέρρει, | ὥσπερ Κοινὰς στέφανον μὲν ἔχων αὐὸν δίψῃ δ' ἀπολωλώς, is given by the scholiast; ἰδίως τὰ ταῖς κλῖναις ἐπιβαλλόμενα ἐλεφάντινα οὕτως ἐκάλουν ἤλεκτρα. μεταφορᾷ οὖν κέχρηται ἀπὸ τῶν κλινῶν· αἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖαι κλῖναι τοὺς πόδας εἶχον ὠφθαλμισμένους ἀνθραξὶ καὶ ἤλεκτροις ὥσπερ νῦν ἀργύρῳ ἢ καττιτέρῳ . . . ἀκολούθως μετὰ τὴν κλίνην ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ τόνου· τόνος γὰρ τὰ τῶν κραββάτων σχοινία . . . ἁρμονίας λέγει τὰ συμπησσόμενα τῶν κραββάτων μέρη. ἐπέμεινε δὲ τῇ τροπῇ.

The word ἤλεκτρος is not known elsewhere in the feminine, nor as part of a piece of furniture. Therefore many commentators transfer the term to a lyre, while Dr. Verrall writes ἤλεκτρῶν and ἁρμονιῶν with capital initials and sees in them characters in Cratinus' plays.

I believe the scholiast to be right, as scholiasts usually are; and I produce the following evidence.

Athen. *Mittheilungen* viii. 357 sq. An

inventory of furniture in the temple of Hera at Samos, p. 371 *εν διφρακον συντετριμμενον του δευτερου διφρακον ενλειπει τα πλεκτρα υπο τουτωι διφρακον | τον τονον ουκ εχε[ι . . . ] κλιντηριος ελεφαντι ποικιλος ουκ ην*. Köhler, who publishes a revised copy of the inscription, remarks 'Weiterhin wird man τὰ πλέκτρα *wenn richtig abgeschrieben* als "das Flechtwerk" fassen müssen; man erwartet τὰ πλεκτά.' Read H for II, sc. τα ἤλεκτρα. The coincidence is striking: in both cases ἤλεκτρα(οι) is followed by τονος. About the latter there is no doubt; see Pollux x. 37 with quotations (adduced by Köhler), and another inscription, *C.I.A.* iv. Pt. ii. p. 178, No. 682 c. κ[λῖναι . . . τοὺς τόνου]ς λίαν ἐντατοί four times repeated. I think these passages amply justify the scholiast, and the difference of gender must be accepted.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Verrall, however, hedges, and says 'the allusion to Electra and Harmonia does not exclude a reference by way of pun to the ἤλεκτρος (-τρον, -τρα) of a bed or a lyre.' I think Electra and Harmonia are excluded not merely because it is a desperate sup-

<sup>1</sup> As it appears that ἤλεκτρος wherever it occurs in literature before Aristophanes is ambiguous (*Soph. Ant.* 1038, which the *Lexx.* quote for the masculine points the other way), viz. equally masculine or feminine, we ought perhaps to let this place decide, and say that ἤλεκτρος f. and ἤλεκτρον n. are the two forms in use in early and classical Greek. The ἤλεκτροι were I suppose the metal, 'white gold,' as the *Dict. Antt.* calls it. The same authority s.v. *Iectus*, brings cases of inlaid bed-feet. See also 'Electrum' in Daremberg and Saglio.

position that two not over well-known heroines should have appeared in Cratinus' comedies, but because Aristophanes' reference generally is not to Cratinus' art but to his condition. Cratinus was an 'habitual,' διψῇ ἀπολωλώς. The jibe 400 can have no other meaning, and Cratinus admits the charge, with a soaker's candour, in the

Πνίγη. His brain, as happens, was not gone; he could, under stimulus, write an amusing play about himself. But 'his plaques were scaling off, his springs were gone, his joints were gaping,' he was afflicted with the consequences of chronic alcoholism.

T. W. ALLEN.

### COS AND CALYMNA.

THE following epigram was recently found in Calymnos by Mr. John Kalesperis, who communicated it to me, together with an impression. My friend Mr. Rudolf Herzog is engaged in editing the inscriptions of Cos and Calymna in the *Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum*, and Mr. Kalesperis has also communicated the stone to him; but as it illustrates a fact regarding the truth of which Mr. Hicks and I had made up our minds when we published our *Inscriptions of Cos* (1892), but which has been since then disputed, I anticipate Herzog's publication.

I there maintained in an Appendix, p. 352, that since an uncertain date (probably in the third century B.C.) and ever afterwards, Calymna was a dependency of Cos. Mr. Angelo Scrinzi in an interesting study (*Kalymna*, Venice, 1899) has, for reasons which I need not here discuss, disputed our contentions. As regards the details of his argument there are valuable corrections of the details of our own; but the best refutation I can offer of his refutation of us taken as a whole is this stone.

The script is not later than the second century B.C. Γ is so with slight apices; we have Α and Α. The stone is broken above and chipped on the r. side.

Above in large letters.

[Ἡραγόρας . . . . .  
τὸν νῖδον  
καὶ . . . . Ἡραγόρα]  
τὸν ἀδελφὸν  
θεοῖς.

Ἐξ ἔτεσιν λίποντα διπλῆς δεκάδος . . . .

ἄρπασεν ὠκύπλους ἁ νεκύων ἄκατος,  
ἐς μακάρων δέ με χῶρον ἐθήκατο, ματρὶ δὲ δῶ[κεν  
δῶρον, ἐπεὶ προτέρα 'πήλθε 'Αἰδαο μύχους.

Πατρὸς δὲ στοργά με κασιγνήτον τε πρὸς αὐγὰς  
'Αελίου μορφὰν θῆκε τυπωσαμένα.

Οὔνομα δὲ κλεόμαν Ξενοκλῆς, δῆμος δὲ Καλύμν[α  
Κῶ δὲ πάτρα, γενέτωρ δ' ἐστὶ μου Ἡραγόρας.

The reading of the end of line 7 and beginning of line 8

ΔΗΜΟΣΔΕΚΑΛΥΜΝ (chipped)

ΚΩΙΔΕΓΓΑΤΡΑ

is certain. The writer of the verses was no great scholar, but he can scarcely have meant Κωι as a nominative (at the present day it is true they say ἡ Κῶ for ἡ Κῶς); so it is locative and perhaps we should restore δῆμος δὲ Καλύμνα 'my deme is in Calymna, my birth-place is in Cos.' But whether Κωι be nominative or locative, what the writer wished to express was that he was a Coan belonging to the deme of Calymna or to one of the Calymnian demes. W. R. PATON.

CALYMNOS, Aug. 12th.

### EMENDATIONS IN THE ARATEA OF CICERO AND AVIENUS.

THESE notes, together with the paper on Germanicus which I published in vol. xiv of this Review, pp. 26-39, are sent as messengers before the face of Mr. P von Winterfeld, who will some day give to the world, I hope and believe, a Syntagma Arateorum.

CICERO.

55, 56.

ipse autem labens mutis Equus ille tenetur  
Piscibus, huic ceruix dextra mulcet  
Aquari.

Write *inde...hinc*. Arat. 282 sq. τὸν δὲ

μετα σκαίροντε δὲ Ἰχθύες ἀμφιμένονται |  
Ἴππον. πᾶρ δ' ἄρα οἱ κ ε φ α λ ῆ χεῖρ Ὑδρο-  
χόιο κτλ., Auien. 645 sqq. 'nam post  
cornipedem flagrant duo sidera Pisces, |  
Pisces Bambycii, *caput autem subter equinum*  
| Laomedontiadae se dextera tendit ephebi.'

123-125.

nam Canis infesto sequitur uestigia cursu,  
praecipitantem agitans, *oriens* iam denique  
paulo,  
curriculum numquam defesso corpore sedans.

Nonsense; write <*distans*>. Vitr. ix 5 3  
'Canis paruo interuallo insequens Leporem.'

187, 188.

Arcturo magnum spatium supero dedit orbe  
Iuppiter; huic *paruum* inferiore in parte  
locauit.

The sense requires the opposite: write *par*  
or *parile*. *magnum* Maybaum.

266, 267.

hic totus medius circo disiungitur, *ipse*  
pectoribus ualidis atque aluo possidet orbem.

*iste* Grotius, which would do for Auienus;  
but Cicero wrote *ille*, and this confusion is  
commoner than that.

334, 335.

hic quantum terris *consectus* pellitur orbis  
tantundem pandens supra mortalibus edit.

Write *conectus*: see *conecta* 452 below.

422, 423.

quos tenet Aegaeo defixa in gurgite *Chius*,  
Bacchica quam uiridi conuestit tegmine  
uitis.

This false quantity is incredible: write  
*tellus* (or *terra*). *Chius* is a marginal gloss  
invited into the text by the haplography  
*gurgitellus*. The two lines are a periphrasis  
of Aratus' Χίω, so the κύριον ὄνομα is better  
away.

437, 438.

cedit conuerso corpore Cepheus  
extremas medio contingens corpore terras.

Write *pectore* in 438: the confusion is  
perpetual. Arat. 649 says ζώνη, and when  
he says ἐπὶ ζώνη at 94 Manilius i 318 trans-  
lates it 'medio sub pectore,' Cicero n. d.  
ii 110 'subter praecordia.' See Hyg. astr.  
iv 6 'Cepheus pectore suo circulum iungit',  
Manetho ii 70 στέρνον θ' ὑπο Κηφέος εἶσι, Auien.  
1200 below.

450-454. Write

at caput et totum sese Centaurus opacis  
eripit e tenebris, linquens uestigia parua

ante pedum coniecta, simul cum lumine  
pandit

ipse feram, <*quam*> dextra tenet. prolabitur  
inde

Anguitenens capite et manibus.

See Germ. 671 'fera, quam dextra portat  
Centaurus.' There is no further lacuna:  
'linquens...coniecta' sufficiently renders  
Arat. 663 sq.

463.

abditur Orion, obiit simul abditus umbra est.

This should answer to Arat. 677 sq.  
πάντα κατέρχεται Ὀρίωνος, | πάντα γε μὴν  
ἀτέλεστα διωκομένοιο Λαγῶος, so for *obiit simul*  
they read *obiit et Lepus*. But write

abditur Orion, *obiit Auritus simul umbras*,  
or *Auritus obiit simul*. See Germ. 341 *auri-*  
*tum* (*auditum* cod. Bonon.) *Leporem*, Auien.  
751 *Auritus*, and for the rhythm 187 above.  
At Manil. ii 209 the MSS have *sacrata est*  
for *sacratas*.

Let me call attention to two corrections  
in which Mr Maybaum has anticipated me,  
101 *summis* for *summi*, 467 *oriens* for *obiens*.

#### AVIENUS.

The two authorities are cod. Vindob.  
palat. 107 saec. x (V) and ed. princ. Venet.  
an. 1488 (E). The cod. Ambros. D 52  
saec. xv (A) is rightly judged by Mr  
Winterfeld to be merely a copy of a copy of  
V: the only phenomenon which even seems  
to conflict with this opinion is 1122 *iubar*  
*ore* Heinsius, *iubar ore* A, *iubar ora* V É.  
But from 1582 to 1878, where V is want-  
ing, A acquires importance, since it is there  
the sole representative of V's strain of  
tradition.

Three of the following conjectures were  
published in this Review in February 1900.  
I have cancelled nine or ten emendations  
which have been forestalled by Mr Winter-  
feld, the best critic Auienus has had since  
Grotius.

136, 137.

indeque Sidoniis *ducel* Cynosura carinis:  
rectior undoso cursus sulcatur in aestu.

*dux est* edd. Write

indeque Sidoniis *duce* *t <e>*, Cynosura,  
carinis  
rectior etc.

164.

at *decline* caput.

Write *decline*: Germ. 61 'serpentis decline  
caput.'

186-190. Write and punctuate thus :

sic insidisse labore  
deuictum fama est. *at, cum* Tirynthius  
aethrae  
inditus et solio fultus sublime paterno est,  
Iuppiter hanc speciem, miseratus acerba  
laborum,  
reddidit et talem cerni permisit Olympo.

*ac tum* VE: at 1308 *at cum* E, *actum* V.  
See 624-9 'hic iam fila nouem docta in  
modulamina mouit | musarum ad speciem  
musa satus, .....*at, cum* | inopia Bassaridum  
carpisset dextera uatem,..... intulit hanc  
caelo miseratus Iuppiter artem.

264-269. Write

nec minus in membris lux olli maxima  
uibrat  
omnibus: ardet apex capiti, micat ignea late  
dextera, flammam umeri, flammam <*mam-*  
*mae*> mouet instar.  
inter utrumque femur, qua se confinia  
*longis*  
diducunt pedibus, *maioris* luminis auras  
uerberat et rutilo sidus magis aestuat astro.

266 *mammæ instar* = 'mammæ species.'  
Hyg. astr. iii 3 'habet autem in *manu*  
*dextra* stellas quattuor,... in *capite* stellam  
unam, in *utroque umero* singulas, in *utroque*  
*mamma* singulas sed *clariorem dextram*.' For  
*instar* VE have *insta* and Mr Robert con-  
jectures *infra*: perhaps 'flammam umeris,  
flammam <*mamma*> mouet, *infra* | inter'  
etc.

267 *longis*] *locis* VE, *latis* Schrader. 113  
*longum* E, *logū* V.

268 *maioris*] *maior* VE, *maior fax* Hein-  
sius. *maioris* luminis sidus auras uerberat.  
'*sidus rutilo astro* aestuat' is an expression  
like 275 '*circulus obliquo late iacet astriger*  
*orbe*', 718, 1516. Erat. catast. 8 ἀνὰ μέρον  
τῶν γωνιάων ἐνὰ λαμπρότατον, ὅς δὲ Ἀρκτοῦρος  
καλεῖται.

471-476. Write and punctuate

Andromedæ capiti suppingitur indiga pleni  
aluus Equi. summo quæ fax in uertice  
uibrat  
uirginis inque auras coni uice surgit acuti,  
ipsa sub abscisso late micat aurea uentre  
cornipedis. simul *hos* lux indiscreta retentat,  
communique rubent duo semper sidera  
flamma.

*hoc* VE. *retentat* means *tenet*, as in descr.  
orb. 492.

537, 538.

at locus olli

post tergum Andromedæ. sic se tulit ordo  
dicatus.

Write

at locus olli

post tergum Andromedæ (sic se tulit ordo)  
dicatus.

Or perhaps *dicatur*, as V has *dicat*. 459  
*rotatur* Grotius, *notatus* E, *notat* V.

545-547.

mundo qua pectora Laniger alto  
urget, et *aduerso* surgentem corpore Taurum  
respicit.

Write *auerso*: Manil. i 263 sq. 'aurato  
princeps *Aries* in uellere fulgens | *respicit*  
admirans *auersum* (*aduersum* MSS) *surgere*  
*Taurum*,' iii 403 '*auerso nascenti sidere*  
*Tauro*' (*aduerso nascentia sidera* MSS).

562-564. Write

in caput inque umeros rotat aegram machina  
mundi

Andromedam: <*tum*> Threicii sub *fla-*  
*br*<*a*> aquilonis  
nititur alato uindex pede.

*Threicii nam sub fabri* V (*fabri*=*fiabr*),  
which E barbarously alters to *Thraici nam*  
*sub flabris*, but in vain, for *nam* still means  
nothing. Perseus is figured as flying toward  
the north pole: Andromeda is nearly at  
right angles to him, with her head eastward.  
I cannot promise that *tum* (i.e. next in  
place) is right: perhaps *fera*.

718-721. Write and punctuate

subtrahit obliquo qua sese circulus orbe  
signifer in borean, *australes* deserat umbras  
ut medii iam mole poli, fera pectora Tauri  
suspiciat Orion.

*australe sederat* VE. Where the zodiac  
rises to its northernmost point at Cancer, so  
that it is separated from the antarctic circle  
by the whole bulk of the mid-sky, there,  
in the room thus left, lies Orion, with his  
head toward Taurus. For the postpone-  
ment of *ut* compare 1072. What Grotius and  
the editors have made of these verses is a  
sight to see.

739-741.

illa autem, interno quæ sunt animata uigore,  
Sirius adtollit, blandusque inlabitur herbas  
*Sirius*, et dulci nutrit tepefacta sereno.

Write *spiritus*, neque enim herbas inla-  
bitur Sirius. VE have *si prius*, not in 741  
but in 740. See Cic. 117 'haec augens  
anima uitali flamine mulcet,' de diu. i 130  
'adspiratio.'

775-779.

rutilat subter Nereia Pistrix,  
efflua percurrrens non multum Fluminis astra.

illa memor longae formidinis, illa *duorum*  
inter signa tenax, horret squalentia monstri  
terga procul pauidumque super caput inserit  
undis.

776. Write *praecurrens*, 'extending beyond': Arat. 358 βαῖδον ὑπὲρ Ποταμοῦ βεβλημένον, Germ. 362 'Belua sed ponti non multum praeterit Amnem.' What could *percurrens* mean?

777. *suorum* Grotius; I should much prefer *priorum*, as better sense and no less easy. *priorum tenax*, remembering the past. 208 *striga* V, write *Stuga*; 580 *tarigite* V, write *Taugete*.

904-906.

ista uolutatos cernuntur cuncta per annos,  
*hac uehit* Oceanus pater omnia mersaque  
rursus  
hauriet Oceanus.

*haec uehit* edd., but the sense requires *uehit* (ae *uehit*): see descr. orb. 63 'enecta dies.' 1375 'cingula cum ueheret pelagus procul Orionis,' means 'when Orion was on the horizon.'

911.

nullus eas alio deprendere certet.

This five-footed hexameter should say of the planets what Aratus says of them in 456 sq. οὐκ ἂν ἔτ' εἰς ἄλλους ὁρόων ἐπιτεκμήραιο | κείνων ἤχι κέονται and Germanicus in 440 sq. 'haud equidem possis alio contingere signo | quae diuis sedes,'—that you cannot give rules for finding them by saying that they lie next to this or that constellation, inasmuch as they have no fixed place. Write then

nullus eas alio deprendere <*sidere*> certet.

Mr Winterfeld inserts *signo* after *alio*: what the editors do I will not say.

984, 985.

iste uenenatae *disiecta* uolumina caudae  
amputat.

Write *dissecta*: that is the worst the tropic of Capricorn can do to the Scorpion's tail.

996-998. Punctuate

hic luci modus et tenebris sub lege magistra  
pensatur: nox aequa diem subit, aemula  
Phoebus  
lumina substituit paribusque reuoluitur  
horis.

The editors put a full stop after 'aemula'.

1055, 1056

illius Oceano quantum submergitur alto,  
tantum *telluris* super eminet.

Arat. 553 sq. τοῦ δ' ὅσον κόλλοιο κατ' ὠκεανοῖο δύνται, | τόσον ὑπὲρ γαίης φέρεται. It is true that ὑπὲρ governs the genitive, but Auienus shared with most of his countrymen the opinion that *super* did not; and he wrote in descr. orb. 610 'fretum super eminet.' Here he wrote either *tellurem* or *telluri*.

1139-1141.

iste Lyrae rutilat conterminus adque sub  
*undis*

hic tenebris petit occidui uada caerulea ponti  
et mox Oceano reparatur clarus eoo.

'sub undis tenebris petit uada'! Write *unis*, that is 'uno eodemque occasu'. Lyra and Engonasin both set when Virgo rises.

1153-1156. Write

iam gurgis et ultima Cyeni  
et caput acris Equi premit *aequore*; iam  
procul ista  
marmoris occidui penitus petiere profundum  
hausta salo.

*aequora* VE, which cannot be saved by Mr Winterfeld's punctuation, de Ruf. Fest. Auien. p. 31.

1198-1202.

Cepheus ipse caput distentaque brachia  
uasto  
induitur ponto, tellurem cingula radunt  
extima et Oceano mersantur pectora rauco  
sola senis: relicum polus a *littore* uersat  
semper inocciduum.

So E, but V a *litorae* re. That is *altior aere*; but Auienus never uses *aer* for *aether*, so write

relicum polus *altior aethere* uersat.

See 60 'polus sublimior,' Germ. 324 'sidera, quae mundi pars celsior aethere uoluit'.

1214-1216.

manus effert dextera praedam  
siluarum, nam prima ferae uestigia *mollis*  
arcum sera manent.

So VE quite rightly: *in ollis* Grotius and edd., which makes nonsense. 'ferae mollis' = 'Centauri mansueti', for this Centaur is Chiron: 887 sqq. 'hic, ubi celso | Pelion adsurgit dorso, . . . arbiter aequi | egerat, Alcidae legum post bella magister'. These last words mean 'legum magister post Alcidae bella', before which Pelion had been the abode of ἀνομία. Mr Winterfeld l.c. p. 24 should not alter *legum* to *Lelegum*: for the misleading order of words compare 1138 'inque genu tantum nixus pede proferat ortum', i.e. pede tantum proferat.



1252.

ipsa dehinc manet exortum *cylidi* Capricorni.

*cylidi* E, *cilici* V: *Cilicis* edd., which is supposed to mean *saetosi*, because there are goats in Cilicia. Write *gelidi*: so 56 'gelido Capricorno', Germ. 7, 289 and perhaps 567, Cic. 58 sq., Manil. i 375, ii 252 and probably iv 743. Mr Winterfeld pp. 12 sq. collects confusions of *g* and *c*: and another follows at 1426.

1377-1380.

hoc ut *fontem unde et duxit* tempora lunae, nauita quo longum facili rate curreret aequor, et quo ruris amans telluri farra parenti crederet.

Write *fonte Meton deduxit* (= *fontem et onde duxit*). I have also corrected the punctuation.

1425-1427.

si moles magna utriusque (= umoris et caloris) occurset sibimet uelut obuia comminus agri, compulsu aërio fragor intonat.

What does *agri*<sup>1</sup> mean? or *uelut* either? and why is *occurset* subjunctive? Write *occurru* sibimet uenit obuia comminus acri. 1506 *uehit* VE, *uelut* A, 1154 *acris* E, *agris* V. *u* is like *it* (descr. orb. 1181 *suus* for *situs*), and *occurrit* must become either *occurset* or *occurrit*.

1459-1462. Write

luminis ista dehinc si crassior adque retunsis cornibus ingreditur sic quarti sideris ortu percussi ut tenuem protendat corporis umbram,

imbribus aut zephyris hebetabitur.

si VE. The editors eject *ut* from 1461: then *si* ought to be *et* and *protendat* ought to be *protendit*. See 1465 sqq. 'si...protollat...currus | sic subrecta faces...ut nec...declinet cornua' etc.

1475-1479.

istius in borean quod se sustollit acumen, si curuum specie uelut adnuat, adfore caelo saena procellosi praedicet flabra aquilonis. namque hoc urgeri sese adserit hocque grauari,

*sūma altae tuendo* docet inclinariet alta.

Write *sic maria et uento* (= *sumartactuendo*). 1097 *labente* E, *labende* V.

<sup>1</sup> Mr Winterfeld (Quellen- und Textkritik Auien., pp. 23 sq.) seems to translate 'comminus agri' as if it were 'prope terram'.

1602-1606.

at matutini si Phoebum litoris acta maiorem solito produxerit, adque per aethram marcenti similis *defluerit* extimus orbis, alta dehinc scandens minuat iubar igniferum sol,

pura serena aderunt.

Write *diffuserit*, as *maiorem* and *minuat* require, even if Aratus had not written 848 *τηκομένην ἐναλίγκιος εἰρήνηται*.

1626-1628.

sed cum radiis marcentibus ardor languet, et tenui tenduntur acumine frustra Phoebei crines, nimbos agat atra procella.

Write *languit*. *languet* A, *languet et in* edd.

1799-1802.

quin et gaudebit arator quisque solum iustis uersabit iustis mensibus anni plebe gruū prima, gaudebit tardus arator agmine pigrarum.

Write *aratro*. 'quisque (= quicumque) aratro solum uersabit iustis mensibus anni' is a periphrasis of Arat. 1075 ὁπαῖος ἀροτρῆς and ought not to contain the word 'arator,' especially when 'tardus arator' follows: see Cic. 422 above.

1803-1807.

pecudes si denique terram lanigeræ fodiant, caput at tendatur in arcton, cum *madidus* per marmora turbida condit Pliadas occasus, cum *brumae in frigora cedit* frugifer autumnus, ruet aethra concitus imber.

Write

pecudes si denique terram lanigeræ fodiant cum *brumae in frigora cedit* frugifer autumnus, caput at tendatur in arcton, cum *matutinus* per marmora turbida condit Pliadas occasus ruet aethra concitus imber.

Arat. 1082 sqq. εἰ δὲ βόες καὶ μῆλα μετὰ βρῖθονσαν ὁπώρην | γαῖαν ὀρύσσουσιν, κεφαλὰς δ' ἀνέμωιο βορῆος | ἀντρία τείνωσιν, μᾶλα κεν τότε χίμερον αὐταὶ | Πληαῖδες χειμῶνα κατερχόμεναι φορέουσιν. Auienus is careful to add that the morning setting of the Pleiades, in November, is here meant, not their evening setting, in April.

1832-1839.

sic in contraria semper uota homines agimur nostrique cupidine fructus

poscimus alterius dispendia. denique *et ipsa*  
sollers natura et rerum genitabilis ordo  
certa suis studiis adfixit signa futuri.  
namque et ouis cupido si gramina tondeat  
ore,  
insaturata cibi, decerpens latius agros,  
*pastor* indicium pluuiialis frigoris edet.

1834. Write 'denique <*cuique*>': -*enique*  
and *cuique* are just alike. Only thus will  
*suis studiis* in 1836 acquire any sense: the  
meaning is, as the context shows, that the  
shepherd can foretell the weather from his  
sheep, the ploughman from his oxen, and  
so on.

1839. Write *pastori*: I do not know  
what possesses the editors to read *pastor id*.

1857-1860.

id parui cum stridunt denique mures,  
cum gestire solo, cum ludere forte uidentur,  
portendunt tibimet; canis id *praesentia*,  
ultro  
tellurem fodiens.

*praesentiat* Breysig, as I could have pre-  
dicted. The subjunctive is irrational after  
*portendunt*; the question is not 'quid praesentiat canis' but 'quid praemoneat'; and  
*praesentia ultro* is only in E: A, which as I  
said at the outset is here in V's absence an  
independent authority, has *i rentia adultis*.  
The archetype therefore had *prentiad*, which  
E mistook for *psentia*: it should have been  
*prentiad*; that is *praenuntiat*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

#### CLEMENT'S PROHIBITIVES IN TERENCE.

UNDER the title of 'Prohibitives in Terence,' in the *Classical Review* for April, 1901, Professor Clement attempts to show that, in my own articles, I misrepresented the frequency of certain kinds of prohibitions in Terence, and the character of the acts prohibited by the different types, respectively. Anyone who undertakes to criticise the work of a fellow-investigator should make sure first that he has read and weighed with scrupulous care every part of the publication he proposes to attack, and secondly, that he has used due care in studying the material upon which he bases any counter-claims. To neglect either one of these two things is in my judgment inexcusable. Professor Clement has neglected both of them. He accuses me, for instance, of having carelessly omitted 14 instances. As a matter of fact all but one of these were intentionally omitted by me, for the very good reason that they could not properly be included. Seven of them belong to the type *oro* (*obsecro*, etc.) *ne facias*. If Professor Clement had read my own discussion with due care, he would have noticed that I said on pp. 135 (3) and 149 (17) of *The Latin Prohibitive* that clauses of this type (with the exception of four or five instances in which an accompanying imperative, the order of words, or some other consideration made it probable that the *ne*-clause was independent) were, as a matter of course, excluded from my discussion, and that I had not even attempted to collect the very numerous

instances of this use. In discussing the distinction between tenses in prohibitions, the type *oro ne facias* should not enter into consideration, for the reason that one can never say that the *ne*-clause is not a subordinate clause. Indeed all such clauses in Cicero (and he is full of them) have, almost without exception, been regarded by all scholars as subordinate. If only a single one of them could be proved to be independent, the theory now in vogue that *ne* with the present subjunctive in prohibitions is foreign to Ciceronian prose (except when addressed to an indefinite second person) would be dead without further discussion. It is a grammatical commonplace that, in the process of subordination, distinctions observed in independent clauses are very frequently obliterated. Such an obliteration of tense-distinctions has occurred in the type *oro ne facias*. Many such instances of the present in Cicero are full of emotion and involve acts that are regarded with great alarm. But what has all this to do with my distinction between tenses in prohibitions? The perfect tense is, as far as I am aware, quite unknown in clauses of this type, with the exception of a few cases in the earliest Latin, where they may have been felt as *quasi*-independent clauses.

Several other of the alleged 'omissions' consist of *caue* with the first and the third persons. Evidently Professor Clement is in the habit of calling such an expression as *caue unquam audiam*, 'take care that I never hear' (Haut. 1031), a prohibition. A

little research will convince him of the fact that, in this, he is quite at variance with all Latin grammars. But even if such expressions were to be classed under the head of prohibitions, it would be quite out of place for Clement to include them in his discussion as to the distinction between tenses, unless he can show that both tenses are used in the first person, *i.e.* unless he can cite instances of the type *caue audiuerim*.<sup>1</sup> How can he talk of a distinction between tenses in expressions in which only one tense is ever allowed? When he says (p. 158) that I cited all the instances of *caue* with the first and third persons in Plautus, Professor Clement is drawing wholly upon his imagination. Only one of the numerous instances was included in my list and the inclusion of this was due to inadvertence.

Another of the 14 instances is said by Clement to be Ad. 942. I fear that my critic did not look beyond his Dziatzko text. There is no manuscript authority whatever for *ne graueret*, the reading adopted by Clement. All of the manuscripts have the imperative *ne graue* and nearly all of the important critical editions from Bentley down to the present time follow the manuscripts. Even Fleckeisen, who in his first edition read *ne graueret*, now reads *ne graue*.

The only one of the 14 instances that should have been included in my list is Haut. 292, and this instance, as will be seen below, is conspicuously in harmony with my theory.

Professor Clement further regards the instances of *uide ne* with the subjunctive as serious omissions in my discussion regarding the distinction between the perfect and present tenses. Is he not aware of the fact that (at least prior to the Period of Decline, for which I can not speak) the perfect tense is not allowed after *uide ne* in prohibitions?<sup>2</sup> Is it not a little unreasonable to insist upon discussing the distinction between two things, when one of the two things has no existence?

My theory regarding the distinction between tenses naturally concerned itself solely with those forms of prohibitions with which both tenses were in common use, *i.e.*

with the types *ne feceris* and *caue feceris* on the one hand, and *ne facias* and *caue facias* on the other. Most of the matter introduced by Professor Clement is wholly irrelevant to this discussion. And much of the relevant matter is treated in the extremely careless manner that characterized the same author's Prohibitions in Silver Latin.<sup>3</sup> A brief survey of this material will suffice to show how little confidence can be placed in his conclusions.

Professor Clement sets out with the rather startling admission that, as regards the perfect tense, there are in Terence four instances decidedly in favour of my theory and none at all against it. He finds, however, three others that he classes as 'doubtful,' *i.e.* he is doubtful whether the acts prohibited by them are sufficiently alarming to prompt an unusually energetic prohibition. Let us glance at these so-called 'doubtful' cases:

Haut. 187 *caue faxis*. Fearing his enraged father, Clinia dare not go home. His friend Clitipho undertakes to shield him from his father's wrath by secreting him in his (Clitipho's) house. Clitipho's father now proposes to invite Clinia's father to dine with them. This would bring Clinia face to face with his father. No more alarming suggestion could well be conceived of from the young men's point of view (cf. 189 and 197 f.), and it evokes from Clitipho the prohibition quoted.

Ad. 458 *caue dixeris*. An outrage of the most disgraceful character has been committed. Every word of the speaker, Hegio, throughout the scene is brimful of passion and indignation. The prohibition is prompted by Geta's reference to the further calamity that will befall, if Hegio deserts them: 'Desert you?' exclaims Hegio, 'Say not that word!'; then, a moment later (498), 'sooner will I lay down my life than desert that family!'

As regards the third instance (Haut. 826 *caue admiratus sis*), *sis* alone may have been felt as the verb, *admiratus* being used as in Plaut. Amph. 89, Cic. Att. 9, 12, 2, Off. 2, 10, 35, etc. It will thus be seen that all the evidence that can count at all supports my contention in the most emphatic manner.

<sup>3</sup> See the review of his article in the American Journal of Philology, xxii, 1.

<sup>1</sup> Even in the third person, only one author, so far as I know, ever used the perfect subjunctive with *caue*, and he used it only once in an intensely emotional passage, where the expression involved the escape of a supposed lunatic (Plaut. Men. 994).

<sup>2</sup> One should be careful not to confuse with prohibitions such expressions as Most. 966 *uide ne quopiam deuorteris* = 'I suspect you have been dropping in somewhere,' lit. 'see lest you have been dropping in,' &c.; see Gildersleeve-Lodge Grammar, § 548, 4.

Professor Clement's treatment of the present tense is still less satisfactory. I have above pointed out most of the irrelevant matter he has here introduced. There are, however, two other passages that should have been excluded, as being so uncertain that they can not be allowed to have any weight in our discussion. In Phorm. 508 *heia, ne parum leno sies*, the *ne*-clause is regarded as subordinate by nearly all editors and commentators early and late, e.g. by Donatus, Wagner, Lindenbrog, Parry, Hickie, Perlet, Lemaire, Westerhovius (ed. Stallbaum), Davies, Sloman (1st edition), Elmer, etc. Professor Clement brushes aside all such authorities by a mere stroke of the pen. Only two editions, so far as I know, regard the clause as a prohibition, viz. those of Bond and Walpole, and Phillips, though Sloman in his second edition gives this as one of the two possible interpretations. The other passage is Hec. 343 So. *Non uisam uxorem Pamphili?* PAR. *Non uisas? ne mittas quidem uisendi causa quemquam.* I quite agree with Professor Clement that I was inconsistent in classifying this *ne mittas quidem* as a prohibition. I did not suppose that I had included any such expression in my list of prohibitions.<sup>1</sup> *Ne-quidem* is of course to be classed with *non* (not with *ne*), as regards its uses. It is not used with a prohibitive subjunctive for the same reason that it is not used with the imperative mood. The will is no more involved in *ne mittas quidem* than it is in the preceding questions *non uisam?*—*non uisas?* to which it is an answer (notice the negatives *non*, *non*, *ne-quidem*). It is, then, parallel with expressions like *non redderes* in Plaut. Trin. 133 (after *non redderem*!), *non sileas* in Hor. Sat. II, 5, 91,<sup>2</sup> and should be classed as an expression of obligation or propriety.

There remain, as legitimate material upon which to base conclusions, eighteen instances of *ne* and *caue* with the present subjunctive.<sup>3</sup> Among these eighteen instances, Professor Clement himself finds only seven that seem to him out of harmony with my theory that the present tense is chiefly confined to prohibitions in which the act prohibited is so unimportant in character that it would not be likely to

prompt unusual energy of expression. It is seen, therefore, that according to Clement's own estimate, my contention is completely vindicated, as regards the general distinction between the perfect and present tenses. But any one who will take the trouble to examine these seven instances will find four of them violently misinterpreted. No impartial student can, I am confident, find anything alarming or shocking in the acts prohibited in the following passages:

Haut. 939 Chremes, *ne quid uereare*, si minus: nil nos dos mouet. The speaker, Menedemus (perfectly calm and matter of fact), wants his son to marry Chremes' daughter. Chremes hesitates to confess how small the dowry must be, whereupon Menedemus says, 'Do not be afraid to tell me the amount of the dowry, even if it isn't very large, for I care nothing about the dowry.'

Eun. 212 PH. *Ne istuc tam iniquo patiari animo.* PAR. Minime: quin factum dabo. Phaedria is sending a present by Parmeno to the girl he loves. The following dialogue takes place: PAR. I wish a man could win money as easily as he'll lose it by sending such presents as this. PHAED. (punning good-naturedly) My heart is lost too (*perreo*) and that is still more valuable; but *don't worry so much over that present.* PA. I'll not worry at all; on the contrary, I'll see that she gets it.

Haut. 302 Perge, obsecro te, et caue ne falsam gratiam studeas inire. The speaker is thrown into ecstasies of delight by what Syrus, the person addressed, is telling him. He can hardly wait for him to tell the rest of the glad tidings. 'Pray do go on,' he says, 'and do not strive to win any gratitude from me that you oughtn't to have.' The speaker shows the most unbounded confidence in Syrus, and even affection for him (cf. *Syre mi* in 291).

Ad. 170 *Caue oculos a meis oculis quouam demoneas tuos.* The speaker is here perfectly calm and deliberate—exasperatingly so. Nothing of any importance depends upon Parmeno's keeping his eyes fixed constantly upon Aeschinus. In fact the former promptly disregards the prohibition with results most gratifying both to himself and to Aeschinus.

<sup>1</sup> I have classified this instance correctly in my Studies, p. 216, also in my article on 'A Neglected Use of the Latin Subjunctive' in the *Classical Review*, xii. p. 203.

<sup>2</sup> See my Studies, pp. 213 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Haut. 302, 745, 939, Eun. 76, 212, 273, 388, 751, 786, 988, And. 205, 704, 706, 980, Phorm. 419, 993, Ad. 22, 170.



There remain only three instances (out of a total of eighteen), Eun. 388 *ne conferas*, Eun. 988, *ne me spectes* and Phorm. 993 *caue creduas*. It will be noticed that in *ne spectes* and *caue creduas* the verbs belong to just the class of verb which my theory would lead one to expect to take the present tense rather than the perfect. No one was ever harmed by having another person look at him, nor by any one else's mere belief. It is true, however, that both of these pro-

hibitions imply other acts that might be disastrous and they may for this reason be counted as exceptional cases.

It will, I hope, be evident from the foregoing discussion that Professor Clement's attempt to overthrow my conclusions has signally failed. And his failure has served to confirm the validity of my theory in the most striking manner.

H. C. ELMER.

Cornell University.

### 'TO EAT' AND 'TO DRINK' IN LATIN.

It is a curious circumstance, and one not especially to the credit of Latin scholarship, that the classical conjugation of two of the commonest verbs in the language appears to be still generally unknown. At the one end of the scale the articles on *adedo*, *adbibo*, and *appotus* in the new *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* disclose a by no means perfect appreciation of the facts. And at the other—but why go to the other? Perhaps it may be enough to mention that within the last few weeks I have seen the proofs of a generally excellent elementary Latin book in which false and unclassical forms from both these verbs were being served up for the unsuspecting schoolboy.

#### A.—*edo* AND COMPOUNDS.

##### I.—The shorter, or unthematic, forms.

Of these forms, to wit: Act. Pres. Ind. *ēs*, *ēst*, *ēstis*. Imperf. Subj. *ēssem*, etc. Imperative *ēs*, *esto*, *ēste*, *estote*.<sup>1</sup> Infin. *esse*. Pass. Pres. Ind. *ēstur*. Imperf. Subj. *ēssetur*. Imper. *estor*,<sup>1</sup> with any more that are still to be discovered, it is asserted that they are irregular. The expression may easily mislead, and in fact appears to have done so. In the sense that these forms do not agree with the norm of the third conjugation, the statement is true; but in no other. *Normal Classical Latin* from Plautus downwards knows no other forms. Accordingly when, for example, the *Thesaurus* gives '*adedere*' for the infinitive of *adedo*, and the index volume of the Tyrrell-Purser edition of the Letters of Cicero '*comedere*' for the infinitive of *comedo*, and add no word of warning, they impute to the classical writers forms which

every one of them we may say would have scouted as barbarous. Further, when, in Georges' excellent *Lexikon der Lateinischen Wortformen* (s.vv. *edo* and compounds) and, with still greater fullness, in Neue-Wagener's no less excellent *Formenlehre*, iii. pp. 614 *sqq.* we find the occurrences of the shorter forms set forth, we are grateful to them for the collections of their diligence; but we have to observe that it begins at the wrong end, and that what we want to know is where in literary Latin the longer forms occur.

Let me be perfectly clear. I do not assert that the form *adēsse*, for example, was in actual use. The *Thesaurus* gives no instance of its employment, and I cannot cite any. What I do assert is that, if a Roman had needed to use the inf. of *adedo*, he would have used *adēsse*; and not *adedere* which the *Thesaurus* gives, also without citing examples.

It would be a waste of space to reprint the, comparatively speaking, very numerous occurrences of these forms in Latin writers of all periods and styles, though their number has hitherto done no more than produce the impression that they are only 'permissible' by the side of the longer forms (Neue-Wagener *l.c.*). I add, however, a few which are cited in neither of the two books referred to. *ēsse* Plautus (I quote by Goetz and Schoell's edition of Ritschl) Most. 959 '*esse et bibi*,' Pliny N.H. 20 § 91, § 121 (*bis*), 22 § 139 (*bis*), Val. Max. 1. 4. 3, 4. 3. ext. 4; *comesse* Phaedrus 1. 20. 4; *essem* Val. Max. 4. 3. ext. 4; *estur* Plaut. Fragm. Boeot., 1. 27. To which *exx.* I should add *est* Prop. 1. 20. 12 (*American Journal of Philology*, xvii. p. 36).

It would be an interesting inquiry, which cannot be undertaken here, when these forms died out of the spoken Latin tongue.

<sup>1</sup> These forms are only attested by grammarians. The length of the root-vowel rests upon the authority of Priscian.



They were alive in the time of Petronius; they were dead in the time of Jerome. For the Vulgate, in which *edo* occurs a number of times and *comedo* with great frequency, knows none but the 'regular' forms.<sup>1</sup> We might expect then that these would creep into our MSS. here and there. That this has not happened to a greater extent than it has is to be ascribed to the grammarians, who in the case of a number of them kept alive the classical tradition.

I pass on to exceptions to the practice in classical times. These fall into two classes. The first arises from corruption in the MS. tradition. Here I should reckon Celsus 7. 13. *exeditur*. As the passive of *exest* (Celsus 5. 19. 19; 5. 22. 2.; 5. 28. 1. fin.) is *exestur*, and as the compound of *estur* (Celsus 2. 25 in. : 5. 27. 3) with *ex* is the same, it appears that we should have the approval of Celsus in restoring this form; and so apparently Neue-Wagener. An *ederem* is cited from Apuleius, Met. 10. 223; but I cannot find the word. If 11. c. 23 (p. 219) is meant, that is 'neque ullum animal *essem*'; in 6. c. 19 the same writer has 'panem sordidum petitem *esto*' (2nd Imper.). It might appear from the index to Friedlaender's Juvenal that '*comedit*' 3. 294 was another example: but the compiler has simply omitted the mark of long quantity and placed the perfect among the presents.

We have as yet been unable to discover the 'veteres' who according to Charisius (p. 261 Keil) and to Diomedes (p. 362 *id.*; his *exx.* below) used forms like *edis edit* (ind.) *ede edite* (imp.). We might guess in vain if Priscian (p. 522. 29 *sqq.* Keil) had not fortunately been more precise. 'In *do* unum anomalum inuenitur '*edo es est.*' uetustissimi tamen etiam '*edo edis edit.*'

Naeuius in Carbonaria:

'Tibi serui multi apud mensam adstant: ille ipse adstat quando edit.'

non potest enim in hoc iambo paenultima syllaba longa esse ut intellegatur praeteritum, ne sit scazon.

Plautus in Lipargo:

'Nil moror mihi fucum in alueo apibus qui peredit cibum.'

corripitur enim paenultima.

Lucilius in IIII:

'Qui edit se hic comedit me.'

In all these places the good grammarian argues with perfect justice that *edit*, *peredit*,

*comedit* cannot be perfects, since perfects would ruin the metres.

Compare the notes of Diomedes (*l.c.*) and Seruius on Virgil Aen. 12. 803 'ne te tantus *edit* tacitam dolor'; Seruius' evidence for the reading of that place is not correctly given in Mr. Hirtzel's note. The lemma has *edat* unquestionably: but Seruius' own text had *edit*. His note is otherwise unmeaning 'scilicet desideriiis urgere Troianos. sane '*edo edis edit* integrum uerbum est, ut lego legis legit.' nam *edo es* anomalum constat.' Seruius then read *edit* in Virgil, and regarded it as an indicative. So completely had the memory of an old subjunctive perished by the time when these grammarians wrote.

## II.—The old subjunctive-optative *edim*.

For the use of *edim* as a subjunctive it would be enough to refer to the collections in Neue-Wagener iii pp. 309 *sqq.*; but I have two or three examples to add.

These are Plautus, Vidularia, 49 'paullum mereat paullum *edit*' (Studemund from A); Cato R.R. 53 'antequam ocinum des quod *edint* boues'; Pliny N.H. 14 § 140 'alius ut quantum biberit tantum *edit* pretium uinolentiae lege accipit,' 22.151 'si quis eruum cotidie ieiunus *edit*, lienem eius absumi certissimi auctores adfirmant,' with which last passage I should class a fragment of Cato 'ad filium uel de oratore' quoted by Diomedes (*l.c.*) for *edit* as an indicative 'lepus multum somni adfert qui illum *edit*.' It might, however, be contended that *edit* is perfect ind. in both passages.

I now return to Priscian and his alleged present indicatives. In considering his statement it is important to note that he, like Seruius, was entirely ignorant of the existence of the old subjunctive *edim*. Not only does he never refer to it, an *ex silentio* argument which in this case it is perfectly fair to press, but, as the present passage shows, when he was confronted with a form like *edit*, only two possibilities occurred to him; (1) that it was *edit* and a perfect indicative, (2) that it was *edit* and a present indicative. We may accordingly dismiss from our consideration his statement that in his three quotations the mood is indicative.

Of the three passages the Plautine one contains a clear subjunctive: 'I do not want a drone in my hive to devour the bees' food.' The Lucilius passage appears to be corrupt in its first words, for which 'qui edit *sese*' have been reasonably conjectured.

<sup>1</sup> In the third century the African Tertullian has *editur* Apologeticus c. 39.

But I have small hesitation in saying that here too *comedit* is subjunctive 'let him eat me up' or 'he may eat me up.' The indicative, 'he eats me up' or, as a question, 'does he eat me up?' conveys no possible meaning. In addition to this it must be noted that Lucilius in this very book, perhaps in this very context, uses the classical form *comest* (Baehrens Fr. P.L. 133). As to the *edit*, I do not feel sure how it should be regarded; but it is perhaps more probably perfect than subjunctive. Two out of the three proofs of a present indicative in *-is-it* have disappeared. The quotation from Naeuius requires but the slightest change to make the subjunctive intelligible. Read and punctuate as follows.

'Tibi serui multi apud mensam adstant:  
ille ipse adstet quando edit!'

'You have many slaves standing by your side at table and is your friend to stand himself when he has to eat!' With this example disappears the last shred of evidence that Priscian's presents were used in classical Latinity.

These subjunctive forms were not only the sole ones in use in pre-Classical Latin; but they lived on into the late Republic and the early Empire, when they were ousted by *edam edas*, &c. It may serve as a landmark in the chronology to observe that Horace does not use *edam*, for Ovid and, according to our MSS., Tibullus do not use *edim*. In Pliny's time *edim* was probably an archaism. For teachers and taught in Classical Latin Composition it may be added that the *-im* forms are probably to be preferred as used not only by Horace, but by Cicero, Virgil, and their contemporary the orator Faunus (ap. Gell. 15. 8. 2). I have myself observed only two instances of the 'regular' subjunctive previous to Tibullus, though I will not say that there are no more. These are Plautus Stichus, 554 'dum equidem hercle quod *edant* addas, meum ne contruncant cibum,' and Poenulus 534 'ubi bibas *edas* de alieno quantum uis usque ad fatim'; for in Cure. 369 *edam* is future. I regard these two examples with the greatest distrust. First, because it seems incredible that the two forms of the subjunctive struggled together for existence for two centuries before the strife was decided in favour of one of them, and this the one which was supported by the analogy of almost every verb in the language. Secondly, because in nearly every case where the scribes recognised these to them abnormal forms, they corrupted them in some way or another;

while, where this was not the case, they were allowed to pass. Thus *edis, edit, edimus, editis* generally escaped; but *edim edint* hardly ever. Accordingly *edint comedint exedint* are corrupted in the MSS., all or some, of Plaut. Men. 457, Truc. 534, Pseud. 821, Cato R.R. 53, Varro ap. Non. p. 94. 21, Cic. Fin. 2. § 22, Plin. N.H. 25 § 46, 28. § 170, Gellius 20. 8. 7. In Stichus 554 we should, I believe, follow Acidalius in reading *edint*; while at Poenulus 534 we should recognise that the copyist not understanding the apparent change of mood 'bibas edis' has simply assimilated the verbal terminations.

Two points may be referred to in conclusion. Consentius (Keil v. p. 382, 32) notes that *ederam* was not in use. This, if the case, was perhaps only a curious accident. The other tenses formed from the perfect seem to have been used and *ederam* is found in compounds, e.g., *adederat* Prop., *excederat* Petron.

The list of compounds of *edo* which Charisius and Diomedes give between them is rather an odd one; *comedo* (as of course was to be expected), then *abedo, ambedo, and circumedo*, for only the second of which is there any literary authority. Not a word of *adedo, exedo, peredo* or *subedo* (*subēs* Plaut. Fragm. Incert. Fab. 26).

#### B.—THE PARTS OF *bibo* AND *poto*.

It is generally recognised that when we say that one of the 'chief parts' of *uideo* is the supine *uisum*, and of *fero* the supine *latum* we are employing a conventional expression. For the purposes of accident the supine in *-um* is taken as typical of certain verbal formations in which the verbal stem and the first consonant of the following suffix are usually the same for all. This similarity, however, is not confined to the supines, the perfect participle and the future participle and infinitive. It appears also in other formations which cannot be left out of account. In form, though not in complete correspondence of function, *latio* and *lato*, e.g., belong as much to the verbal system as *latum* or *latus*. This consideration, not without its importance to the present inquiry, does not always receive its due share of attention. We are apt to forget the bonds of association in virtue of which the verbal in *-tio* is often an equivalent of the gerund and the verbal in *-tor* almost a participle. As a matter of convenience, however, I shall in most of what follows confine my attention to what may

be called in a stricter sense the verbal group; the supines (especially the supine in *-um*) the past participle and the future participle and infinitive. It may be as well to point out here that the inter-association of these forms, powerful though it is, is not always strong enough to produce outward uniformity, the future participle for example occasionally deviating from the other formations.

Turning now from form to function we ask what constitutes the claim of a 'part' of a verb to be regarded as such. The answer is at hand: it is *syntactical correspondence*. If in the same context *tuli* and *latum* can be used in strict correspondence to *fero*, as they can, then they will be, as they are, the perfect and supine of *fero*. It is a deduction from this and from observed facts of language that different verbs (e.g., *tollo* and *suffero*) may have the same perfect or supine.

As regards *bibo* and *poto* the following views claim to be discussed. They are not all of course held by the same people.

- (1) *bibo* has *bibitum* for its supine.
- (2) *bibo* has no supine.
- (3) *poto* has *potum* for its supine.
- (4) *poto* has *potatum* for its supine.

(1) need not detain us long; *bibitum*, &c., are monstrosities hatched by the later Latin; *bibitus* is as foreign to the genius of classical Latin as *gignitus* (some one calling himself Solinus) or *sistitus* would be, as  $\tau\pi\pi\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  or  $\tau\delta\iota\delta\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  would be to that of Greek. For these forms of the end of the third century, see (Neue-Wagener iii. pp. 540 (*bibitum*, *bibitus*) and 583 (*bibiturus*)).

(2) is in itself absurd; but must be taken in connexion with (3), which is apparently the common view and that of the *Thesaurus*.

Against it nothing more is required than to quote a few passages which show that the participle of *bibo* in classical times was *potus*.

Ovid Met. 15. 333 sq. 'ambiguus suspectus aquis quas nocte timeto; | nocte necant potas, sine noxa luce bibuntur'; ex Pont. 3. 4. 55 sq. 'illa bibit sitiens lector, mea pocula plenus; | illa recens pota est, nostra tepebit aqua'; Pliny N. H. 20 §182 sq. *bibitur* [git] drachma una et contra araneos. destillationem narium discutit tusum in linteolo olefactum—difficultates spirandi addito nitro potum, §217 'sanat... uentris et intestinorum fluctiones semen ex aqua potum. *bibitur* et in choleris cum ruta.' 21 §159 'prodest et orthopnoicis radix eius in aqua ieiunis pota. est autem candida intus et dulcis. *bibitur* et

contra serpentium ictus ex uino.' More examples could be quoted from these books: but they are surely needless.

So also in the compound *ebibo* and *epotus*. To drink a river up is *ebibere* Ov. Met. 8. 836 (fretum) 'ebibit amnes'; the river so treated is *epotus* Juv. 10. 177 'epotaque flumina Medis,' (but the fourth century writer Trebellius Pollio Claud. 6 §6 of the same thing 'epotata flumina'). *epotus* again expresses the completion of the act of *bibere*; Ov. Met. 5. 451 sqq. 'dum bibit illa datum—neque adhuc epota parte'.

Just as *bibo edo* form a standing antithesis, so do their participles. I may quote Plautus Trin. 406 'exessum, expotum, exunctum, elutum in balineis' (for *ebibere* = *bibendo perdere* cf. Hor. Sermon. 2. 3. 122); Cicero Cluent. 173 'celerius potuit comestum (or *comesum*) quam epotum in uenas—permanere.'

Celsus has an interesting variation. Apparently he uses *epotus*, not *potus*, as the participle of *bibo* as of *ebibo*; 5. 27. 11 sq. 'oleo multo epoto uomere—*bibere* antidotum—si cantharidas aliquis *ebibit*.' This seems to be a medical use. Medicine is generally disagreeable to the palate and most of us can remember being told as children 'to drink it off and have done with it.' Cicero uses *bibisse* Cluent. 167 and *epotus* ib. 168 of the poison said to have been administered to Balbus. We must note that in this connexion *bibo* (not *poto*) is the proper word, or we miss the force of Lucretius' intentional deviation in the famous simile in l. 936 sqq. 'sed ueluti pueris absinthia taetra medentes | cum dare conantur, prius oras pocula circum | contingunt mellis dulci flauoque liquore | ut puerorum aetas improvida ludificetur | laborum tenus, interea perpotet amarum | absinthii laticem deceptaque non capiatur | sed potius tali pacto recreata ualescat.' It is not so very easy to reproduce the ironic touch in this unusual substitute for *ebibat*: 'drink through,' or 'swill down' would give the sense intended. Compare Varro's description of the greedy tipping bees R. R. 3. 16. 35 'aspargi eas oportet aqua mulsa quo facto non modo desistant pugna sed etiam conferciunt se lingentes, eo magis si mulso sunt asparsae, quo propter odorem audius adplicant se atque obstupescunt potantes.' There is irony again at Lucr. 4. 1097 sqq. 'ut bibere in somnis sitiens cum quaerit et umor | non datur, ardorem qui membris stingere possit | sed laticum simulacra petit, frustra que laborat | in medioque sitit torrenti flumine potans,' not *bibens*; that is just what he does

not do. For, as Lucretius says, the dreamer *bibere quaerit*.

In one compound of *bibo*, *potus* has its active sense. This is *adbibere* 'to drink in,' 'suck in,' which is almost entirely confined to the sense of taking in liquor, Plaut. Stich. 382 'quando *adbibero* adludiabo.' This verb, which must have been in more frequent use than would appear from the literature as the Schol. on Hor. Serm. 2.6.68 uses it to explain 'siccat calices,' has for its participle *adpotus*; Plaut. Cure. 354 'postquam cenati atque *adpoti*;' Rud. 566 and Amph. 282 'probe *adpotus*,' 'having taken one's liquor on board.' Gellius, 6.7.7., seems to have misunderstood this word as he says that *ad* has an intensive sense in it, as in 'adprobatus...quod significat valde probus,' though according to Annianus' rule there should then be an accent on the prefix.

But it may be that *poto* also has rights in *potus*; and this we must now consider. From the point of view of the form it can have none. There the advocates of (4) are clearly in the right. *potus* is itself no more the participle of *potare* than *iactus* of *iactare* or *mactus* of *mactare*. As for the meaning *poto* was a frequentative verb and conveyed by its stem-inflexion the idea of a repetition of the action of drinking. *potus* meant simply 'having been drunk' (passive) or 'having drunk' (active) whence, adjectivally, its common use, 'drunk' or 'tipsy.' *potus* then could only become the participle of *potare* through some confusion of the spheres of the two verbs.

This confusion had not taken place in the time of Plautus. I cannot find a single place in his writings where *poto* need not have its original force of 'drinking repeatedly,' or *drinking*, i.e. *tippling*. It would be waste of space to accumulate references, so I will simply give from my lists the occurrences of the verb in three of his plays. *Asinaria* 270, 602, 826, 851; *Mostellaria* 20, 36, 295, 394, 941, 958, 964, 1139; *Menaechmi* 186, 214, 476, 792 (*bis*), 914, 950 (ironical).

In one use, it is true, the verbs were already approximating. In the tenses which may express continued action in Latin, e.g. the present, there might be little difference between the verbs. 'I go on drinking' *bibo* and 'I take drinks' *poto* were practically equivalents. Hence in the region of conviviality, apart from those subtle associations which it is vain for us to try to appraise, *bibo* and *poto* are synonymous. Cicero Phil. 2 § 104 'ab hora tertia *bibebatur*'; ib. § 67 'totos dies *potabatur*.'

Horace *carm.* 1. 38 *fin.* 'me sub arta | uite *bibentem*'; 2. 11. 13 *sqq.* 'cur non sub alta uel platano uel hac pinu iacentes—*potamus*?'

One applied use of *poto* which is not due to confusion may be mentioned here. It is used metaphorically but quite correctly of wool fabrics 'soaking' in the dyer's vat. Horace Ep. 1. 10. 27 'Aquinatam *potantia* uellera fucum' where the pres. part. of *bibo* could not have been used, and in Martial 2. 29. 3 'quaeque Tyron totiens *epotauere* lacernae' where similarly *ebiberunt* would have been misconceived. Not so very far off is the use in Lucr. 4. 1127 *sq.* 'teriturque thalassina uestis | adsidue ac Veneris sudorem exercita *potat*.' The irony in 'exercita *potat*' is manifest.

One of the earliest invasions of *bibo*'s territory by *poto* seems to have been in the drinking of animals. To *bibere* Varro R.R. 2. 4. 17; 2. 5. 17; 3. 7. 5 and of the sacred chickens in the well-known story of the profanity of Claudius Pulcher (Cic. N.D. 2. § 7; Val. Max. 1. 4. 3) corresponds *potum* Virg. Ecl. 7. 11 'huc ipsi *potum* uenient per prata iuueni, and Prop. 4. 4. 6 'quo dulcis ab aestu | fistula *poturas* ire iubebat oues.'

The 'nomen agentis' of *bibo* in these as in other senses was *potor*. It had the advantage of shortness over the more strictly correct *potator* from which it was not sharply distinguished; '*potatores* maximi' Plaut. Men. 259, 'acris *potoris*' Horace Serm. 2. 8. 37. On the other hand 'Rhodani *potor*' Hor. Carm. 2. 20. 20; but '*potator* aquae sub nomine Lethes | quae fluit' Sil. 16. 476. For the Greek *συνπότης* Cicero has *compotor* and Terence the fem. *compotrix*: in Ambrose it is *compotator*. It thus joined with *poto* to draw *potus* away from *bibo*.

From another side the word *potus* was ready to fall an easy prey to *poto*. *Potus* must have lost the active participial force early. We can trace it in *adpotus*, and there is just a recollection of it in a phrase like Hor. Ep. 2. 2. 214 *sqq.* 'Iusisti satis, edisti satis atque bibisti: | tempus abire tibi est, ne *potum largius aequo* | rideat et pulset lasciua decentius aetas.' In the sense of 'drunk' *potus* seemed to mean more naturally *qui potauit* than *qui bibit*.

Meanwhile under the influence of a well-known tendency in language, seen for example in *jeter* from *iactare*, the frequentative or intensive force was fading out of *poto*, and it could be used as a simple equivalent of *bibo* as it is in fact sometimes used in the Vulgate.<sup>1</sup> These, and perhaps

<sup>1</sup> I am not concerned with the late causative use



the deflecting force of cognate words which began with *pot-* succeeded finally in detaching *potus* from the now isolated *bibo*, and made it possible on the one hand for the prodigious *bibitus* to spring up, and on the other for Priscian to declare that the participle of *poto* was *potus*.

To sum up: *potum*, *potus*, *poturus*, is for classical Latin the proper supine and participles of *bibo* (and of *poto* if used in the simple sense of drinking); *potatum*, *potatus*, *potaturus* of *poto* in its own frequentative sense. Thus 'mecum i *potatum*' Plaut. Pseud. 1327; 'tamquam leuia quaedam uina nihil ualent in aqua, sic Stoicorum ista magis *gustata* quam *potata* delectant' Cic. Tusc. 5 § 14 (*pota* would have been impossible); '*potaturus* est apud me' Ter. Phorm. 837.

Of the two exceptions to the classical usage that I have noticed in the texts of the writers of classical times one is Celsus 4. 19 ad fin. where *potata* was condemned for a gloss by Targa and is omitted in Darem-*of pota* (= *potum do*) for which see Rönisch *Itala u. Vulgata*, p. 376.

berg's recension; it is certainly in disagreement with the usage of Celsus as already pointed out. The second is Valerius Maximus 2. 4. 5 '*calefactamque aquam pueris bibendam dedit qua potata*' e.q.s. Here there is very good MS. authority for *pota*. Valerius uses *potauit* in its proper sense at 3. 6. 6. In Pliny N.H. 20. 136 '*ad erapulae grauedines decoquantur folia poturis*' (*potaturis* E, d) either variant is correct as Latin.

I have set forth the facts relating to the classical usage of these two indispensable verbs because they are widely ignored. I do not claim that they are altogether unknown. For example, after I had discovered for myself the true supine of *bibo* I found in M. Brenouf's *Les Hellénismes dans la Syntaxe Latine* p. 268 and n. (2) '*Le supine n'était pas usité pour certains verbes; ainsi bibitum qui ne fut employé que très tard... Il était remplacé par potum ou potatum*'. Col. 12. 51. 3 *dabitur potatum imbecillis bubus*<sup>1</sup> Virg. Buc. 7. 11,' quoted above.

J. P. POSTGATE

<sup>1</sup> I have not been able to find this place.

#### DR. WISSOWA ON THE ARGEI.

(IN PAULY'S *Real-Encyclopädie*, ED. 2, VOL. I. PP. 689 *fol.*)

THIS important article, if (as seems to be the case in Germany) its conclusions be accepted, goes far to solve an old and provoking difficulty in Roman religious antiquities. The section on this subject in my 'Roman Festivals' was written, and indeed rewritten, before the article reached me; and had I fully grasped the importance of Dr. Wissowa's treatment of the subject I should doubtless have written it a third time. This, however, I failed to do until after my book was in print. Now, after most carefully considering Dr. Wissowa's arguments and conclusions, I feel compelled to make a few observations on them.

It will be remembered that there are two rites at Rome connected with the name Argei; (1) in all probability a procession round 24 (or perhaps 27) *sacella* or *sacraria* Argerorum, on March 16 and 17; (2) the casting of 27 (or possibly 24, or according to Dionysius 30) *simulacra hominum* made of rushes into the Tiber from the pons sub-*licius* on May 14 (according to Ovid) or

May 15 (according to Dionysius).<sup>1</sup> Of the first of these rites we know nothing certainly, though in Varro L.L. 5. 45-54 we have fragments of what seems to be an itinerary for the use of a procession going round the *sacella*. Of the second we have tolerably explicit accounts; we know that the Pontifices (and according to Dionysius the *σπαργητοί*) were present at the ceremony, also the Flaminica Dialis in mourning, and that the Vestals themselves cast the simulacra into the river. The connexion between the two rites is not absolutely certain, but has generally been assumed as a fact since Jordan wrote his chapter on the Argei in his *Römische Topographie* (II. 237 *fol.*). Nor is it certain that the number of *sacella* and the number of simulacra was the same; this cannot be proved from the text of Varro (cp. L.L. 5. 45 and 7. 44). Dr. Wissowa concludes that the number in each case was 27,

<sup>1</sup> The references will be found in full in Wissowa's article, and the most important in my *Roman Festivals*, p. 111 *fol.*



following Mommsen's somewhat cautious note in *Staatsrecht* III. 125; this is the conclusion which best suits his own views,<sup>1</sup> and we may provisionally accept it, remembering, however, that it is not a certainty.

Thus it would seem that we have no very secure foundation for conjectures as to the real meaning of either of the rites. But since the appearance, first of Jordan's chapter, and secondly of that of Dr. Mannhardt in his *Antike Wald- und Feldkulte*, some new light seemed to be thrown on the mystery. We began to believe (1) that the *sacella* were the centres of some ancient 'Cultusordnung' of the districts which became the four Servian regions: (2) that the casting of the simulacra into the Tiber was a rite of very primitive character, possibly a rain-spell, which may be compared with many strikingly similar ceremonies now familiar to anthropologists. Dr. Wissowa's explanation is altogether different, and as startling as it is interesting. It may be briefly stated thus. Both rites are of late date, probably of the third century B.C., and of Greek origin: they are not survivals of primitive custom or worship, as the 'comparative anthropologists'<sup>2</sup> would persuade us. Probably (he writes) at some date between the first and second Punic war, a Sibylline oracle directed that, in order to assuage a famine or pestilence, twenty-seven Greeks (the traditional enemies of Rome, as he calls them) should be sacrificed by being cast into the Tiber. If I understand him rightly, he believes that these victims were first detained for a while at certain points in the four Servian regions, so as to spread their healing influence throughout the city (this would be the origin of the March rite): and that two months later they were taken in procession to the *pons sublicius*, and there sacrificed by drowning. He conjectures that the actual sacrifice only occurred on the first occasion, and that substitutes, in the form of the *simulacra*, took their place regularly in subsequent years.

The evidence brought together for this revolutionary theory is somewhat complicated: but the leading points in it seem to be as follows.

1. Argei really = 'Αργεῖοι, as the Romans themselves believed. The history of the

revival of this etymology is this: Mommsen, when writing the third volume of his *Staatsrecht*, applied to Willamowitz-Möhlendorf for an opinion about the word, and part of the latter scholar's reply is quoted on p. 123 of that volume. One sentence only seems to contain anything like a definite pronouncement; it runs thus 'Ein Name für das Hellenenvolk ist das Wort nie gewesen, höchstens in Anschluss an Homer von Dichtern, zum Beispiel von Ennius im *Medea*-prolog, so verwendet worden.' Next H. Diels, in his valuable book on the Sibylline oracles (p. 44, note) amplified this sentence while endeavouring to show that the name *Αργεῖοι* came to Rome through the Sibylline oracles: this is the amplification: 'Willamowitz (bei Mommsen *l.c.*) hat richtig vorgehoben dass der Name (*i.e.* Argei) griechischen Ursprungs ist (*Αργεῖοι*), und bei den Griechen nur in der von Homer abhängigen Poesie synekdochisch für 'Ἕλληνες eintreten kann. Geht man von diesem Fundament aus, so ist, mein' ich, der Schluss zwingend, dass nur auf dem Wege griechischen Orakelpoesie, die Argei in den Römischen Cult, und von da in die Sprache übergegangen sein kann.' Dr. Wissowa now goes yet a step further, quoting Diels as having proved the equation Argei = 'Αργεῖοι, and approves his conclusion that there *must* have been an oracle in the third century ordering the sacrifice of twenty-seven Argei = Greek captives. In spite of these developments, a cautious inquirer will be apt to think that we are after all much as we were about the etymology of the name. I am quite unable to see that either Willamowitz, Diels, or Wissowa have proved anything either as to the history or the etymology of the word Argei. No parallel instance of its use has been discovered, in the Sibylline oracles or elsewhere; and the equation with 'Αργεῖοι is as hypothetical as ever. The etymology may be a little more likely than others, (see however H. Nettleship, *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*, s.v.), but an uncertain etymology is of no practical use without a history of the word — and that history is in this case not forthcoming.

2. Dr. Wissowa's own chief contribution to the argument is the following. The Argean rites are not to be found in the so-called Numan calendar, *i.e.* in the *Fasti* of which so many fragments survive; they are therefore, he argues, of later origin, *i.e.* later in all probability than the Decemvirate. Now we used to explain this absence from the

<sup>1</sup> He holds with Diels (*Sibyllinische Blätter*, p. 42 foll.) that the number 27 should be accepted as having special religious significance at Rome as well as in Greece and elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup> The inverted commas are Wissowa's, and speak his well-known contempt for the species.

Calendar by assuming that they were of the same character as the Septimontium, Paganalia, &c., which are also absent from the Calendar yet undoubtedly ancient; and that in the well-known definition of *publica sacra* in Festus 245 they are referred to as well as and together with the Septimontium, Paganalia, and Fornacalia. 'Publica sacra quae publico sumptu pro populo fiunt, quaeque pro montibus, pagis, curiis, sacellis.' The last words of this passage have generally been taken to refer to a different class of rites from those which were *publico sumptu*; the latter are those noted in the Calendar in large letters, while the other class comprises those divisions of the state which worshipped collectively,—pagi, montes, curiae, and lastly sacella, by which word the Argean sacella seem to be indicated. (Marquardt, Staatsverwaltung iii. 120: Mommsen, Staatsrecht iii. 123 foll.) Dr. Wissowa is naturally concerned to show that we have been all wrong in referring *sacella* in this passage to the sacella Argeorum, and that we have here no explanation at all of the absence of the latter from the Calendar. His argument seems to me a weak one. Varro, he says, uses both *sacellum* and *sacrarium* of the Argean chapels: but the latter he uses twice, the former only once: *sacellum* cannot therefore be the technical word in use at Rome for the Argean chapels, and these latter cannot be referred to in the passage of Festus. That *sacrarium* was the right word has indeed been shown by Jordan (Top. ii. 280). *Sacellum*, according to him, was a general word for an unroofed shrine, which might come into use in a loose way for the same thing indicated by *sacrarium*, which was properly a place in which sacred objects were deposited. I confess I do not see why Festus, or Verrius Flaccus before him, should not have used *sacella* for the Argean chapels in this general sense. Livy's expression is *loca sacris faciendis* (1. 21. 5): he avoids, as Dr. Wissowa says, a technical expression: rather, he does not use it because he does not know it: Varro himself vacillates: why should we expect to find the technical term in Festus alone? Too much surely should not be built on the use of a word in and after the Augustan age for an almost forgotten thing.

But whoever will prove that the *sacella* in Festus's gloss are not the sacella Argeorum, must also attempt to show that we have no reason to believe that the latter were the centres of an ancient religious division of the city. This question turns

almost entirely on the passage in Varro L. L. 5. 45 which has been already referred to. Prof. Robinson Ellis has been kind enough to obtain for me from Florence the exact reading of the Laurentian MS.: I find it is correctly quoted by Dr. Wissowa from the second Spengel edition. Varro is discussing the names of the seven hills; he deals with the Capitoline and the Aventine (with the Velabrum), and then goes on thus:—*Reliqua urbis loca olim discreta, cum Argeorum sacra in septem et viginti partis urbi sunt disposita. Argeos putant e principibus qui cum Hercule Argivo venere Romam et in Saturnia subsederunt. E quis prima est scripta regio Suburana, secunda Esquilina, tertia Collina, quarta Palatina.* He then proceeds to take the four regiones one by one, with the names of the hills included in them, some of which, forgotten in his own day, he quotes from the document which he calls *Argeorum sacra* (or *sacrificia*).

There is certainly nothing in this passage as it stands to convince anyone that the *sacraria* indicated local divisions, except the words 'cum Argeorum sacra in septem et viginti partis urbi sunt disposita'; and these words as they stand in the MS. do not suit with what follows: for after the parenthetical sentence about the Argei (if indeed he ever wrote that sentence) Varro goes on 'e quis prima est scripta,' etc., where the 'e quis' cannot refer to 27 partes urbis, for the regiones were four only. Either something has fallen out before the 'e quis,' or we must read with Spengel and Wissowa himself '*Reliqua urbis loca olim discreta, cum Argeorum sacra in septem et viginti in quatuor partes urbis sunt disposita.*'

This correction would be satisfactory enough, if we could be sure that the rest of the passage stands as Varro wrote it,—but this is exactly what I myself find it very difficult to believe. How are we to account for the insertion of the sentence 'Argeos dictos putant,' etc., between 'partes' and the relative? Why, again, should Varro here use the word *partes* for the four Servian regions, which elsewhere he calls by their proper name?<sup>1</sup> Still, though I have doubts about Spengel's improvement of the sentence, I agree with Dr. Wissowa that the general meaning of the passage, so far as we can discover it, taken in connexion with the whole of the context, does not suggest that

<sup>1</sup> After a fresh reading of his chapters 45–46, I am inclined to think that Varro here uses *partes* of four districts of the city before they became technically organised as *regiones*. 'E quis (partibus) prima est scripta regio Suburana,' &c., he adds.

the *sacraria* were necessarily the centres of religious divisions of the city. O. Müller did not so understand it, as may be seen by his note: and even in England Burn, who was a scholar and knew his literary authorities well, was not misled: 'Varro means,' he writes (*Rome and the Campagna*, p. 39, note 1), 'that the rest of the city was divided already into districts (*i.e.* regiones) at the time the Argean chapels were instituted.' But on the other hand the passage is too doubtful to admit of being used to prove that the *sacraria* Argeorum were *not* the *sacella* of which Festus speaks: from his words we are compelled to believe that there were in Rome some *sacella* which were the religious centres of some local divisions: and if they were not the Argean *sacella*, what were they? No attempt is made to answer this question except by referring to a passage in Cic. *de Leg. Agr.* ii. 14, 35,<sup>1</sup> which seems to me to have no bearing on the difficulty whatever.

3. A third argument used by Dr. Wissowa, but one on which he does not seem to lay much stress, is that two out of the three days of the Argeorum *sacra* (supposing that the third was May 14 and not 15 as Dionysius reports), are days of even numbers, and that thus the rule is violated, which holds good with a single exception<sup>2</sup> throughout the Roman calendar, that State festivals must take place on days of odd numbers. This, he argues, indicates that the Argeorum *sacra* were of later date than that of the drawing up of the calendar. He is here on ground which is peculiarly his own, and where I confess I hardly feel equal to following him. But I may venture to ask two questions: (1) can we be sure that the ancient moveable feasts which were undoubtedly older than the calendar, *e.g.* Ambarvalia and Compitalia, never took place on days of even numbers? and (2) are not the days which immediately precede Ides and other festivals closely connected with these in character (so Mommsen, *C.I.L.*, vol. i., ed. 2, p. 290), and would there not be less objection, as in the case of March 14, to retaining these as the days of ancient festivals, even after the formation of a regular calendar, than to fixing them on ordinary days of even number? March 16

precedes the Liberalia (anciently Agonia), and May 14 precedes the Ides. Again, it seems to me that those who believe that the *sacra* Argeorum belong to the same class of festivals as the Septimontium, etc. can as legitimately argue that, as not belonging to the State festivals proper, they might never have been subject to the rule of odd numbers, as Dr. Wissowa can argue that from the point of view which he adopts as to the date of the *sacra*, they ought to have been subject to that rule. So with another argument which he uses in passing, viz. that if the Argeorum *sacra* were older than the calendar, they would have had an influence on the character of the days: March 14 is marked C and May 14 F in the calendar, while all State festival days are N or NP. But the days on which the Compitalia were usually held (Jan. 3 and 4) are marked C: so also those on which the Paganalia were held (Ovid *Fasti* 1. 658 foll.), and the date of the Ambarvalia was usually May 29, as we have reason to believe, which is also marked C.

These are Dr. Wissowa's chief arguments for his theory of the late and Sibylline origin of the Argean rites; and I confess that I find them far from convincing. I must add that there are also one or two difficulties which seem to me fatal to it. Why were not the decemviri sacris faciundis, who had charge of the Sibylline oracles and superintended the rites ordained by them, present at the ceremony? The *personnel* of the ceremony at the bridge emphatically suggests an ancient Roman origin: Pontifices, Vestals, and Flaminica Dialis in mourning. Dr. Wissowa has simply made no attempt to get rid of this objection to his view; it is in fact impossible to do so. He frankly acknowledges that the Flaminica is not known to have put on mourning for any but ancient Roman festivals (see my *Roman Festivals*, 115). Dionysius (i. 38. 3) says that the *στρατηγοί* were present, *i.e.* according to Jordan (*Top.* i. 1, 288) the praetor urbanus, who certainly did preside at some ceremonies of the *ritus graecus*: but so did he also at the Compitalia, as we learn from Gellius 10. 24. 3. Almost in despair, as it would seem, for his theory, Dr. Wissowa appeals to the fact that human sacrifice was foreign to the Roman character and practice, and insists that the drowning of twenty-seven persons must be Greek in origin: to which we might answer that those who have once been convinced that Mannhardt's explanation from parallel primitive customs

<sup>1</sup> 'Sunt enim loca publica urbis, sunt sacella, quae post restitutam tribuniciam potestatem nemo attigit, quae majores in urbe partim periculi perflugia esse voluerunt. Haec lege tribunicia Xviri vendunt.' I know of no clue to the identification of the *sacella* here mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> This exception he has tried to explain in his work *de Feriis*, ix. foll. See my *Roman Festivals*, p. 44.

throws more light on the mystery than anything that has as yet been written about it, do not need to believe that it originated in human sacrifice at all.

Another difficulty, almost as fatal in my opinion, is this. If twenty-seven Greeks were really sacrificed at some date between the first and second Punic war, when records were beginning to be constant and reliable, why has every trace been lost of such an astonishing circumstance? It is exactly what the Epitomist of Livy would naturally have picked out to record, and that it would be in Livy's own work we may be absolutely sure. The much less striking sacrifice of a pair of Gauls and a pair of Greeks in 226 B.C. and again in 216 B.C., is frequently referred to (see Wissowa's references, p. 699); yet of the supposed oracle and its twenty-seven victims there is not even a hint to be found in all later literature. All memory of it must have vanished with astonishing celerity: for no Roman scholar ever alludes to it in attempting to explain the *Argeorum sacra*. Many such attempts were made, and Dr. Wissowa rightly brushes them aside: but it does not seem to occur to him to ask why the true

explanation should have been utterly forgotten of a rite so recent in origin as he believes it to have been.

I cannot but think it a pity that this eminent scholar should so absolutely decline to learn anything from the despised comparative anthropologists. I venture to say that if he had really studied, and not merely referred to, Mannhardt's *Baumkultus* and *Wald- und Feldkulte*, he would have been saved the trouble of constructing an entirely new theory on very doubtful foundations. He need not have agreed with Mannhardt's conclusions and explanations; but he might have recognised that they cover the known facts far better than one which, like that I have been examining, flies in the face of the evidence afforded by the leading features in the cult. It certainly cannot be said of Mannhardt's explanation, as assuredly it must be said of Dr. Wissowa's, that it leaves out of account not only the *personnel* of the procession to the *pons sublicius*, but the importance of the bridge, and of the river itself, in the general character of the ritual.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

#### A HOROSCOPE FROM EGYPT.

IN Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, II. we have at p. 137 a horoscope, which after communication with Dr. Rambaut they believe to be inexact. Not feeling satisfied with some of the assumptions made in their commentary, I referred the case to the Astronomer Royal and now Mr. P. H. Cowell of Greenwich Observatory having very kindly determined the position of all the planets, fixes the date of the horoscope in A.D. 14. The horoscope is entirely correct. He writes that Saturn was on the boundary then between Sagittarius and Capricorn, just leaving Sagittarius not to return for twenty-eight years: the Moon entered Taurus on September 29 and left it October 1. Two or three interesting consequences may be noticed. (1) The missing year of Tiberius' reign will be the first; he succeeded on August 14, and September 29 in this document is counted in his reign. This is evidence that has been needed for some time for finally determining how in Egypt the emperors' reigns were delimited. (2) The date according to the

old Egyptian reckoning comes out correctly as the night between September 29 and 30. (3) The date by the Augustan fixed calendar makes that calendar begin as it was intended by its patron to do, on August 30. Investigation is needed to ascertain whether this is not in reality the case in other instances, in which case Dr. G. F. Unger's rule (*I. Müller Hand. d. Kl. Altertums-Wissenschaft* vol. i. p. 778) will need revision. (4) The night is made to begin at sunset, which would have been on the night in question at Alexandria almost exactly at 6.0 p.m. The birth we are told was *ἀπὸ τετάρτης τῆς νυκτὸς* and the Sun was in the Sign next to that which was setting. The time therefore would be about 9.0 p.m. The next Egyptian day began about 3 a.m. (5) The Julian year diverged from the Egyptian year at the exact rate, of course, of one day in four years: it is conceivable that the Augustan year was based on the Sothic or fixed Egyptian year, which diverges from the vague Egyptian at a rather greater rate. If so, in every 112 years or



so, the Julian and Augustan would diverge by one day. An examination<sup>1</sup> of double dated Egyptian records shows that in 29, 80, and 137 A.D. the Augustan year began on August 29. From Censorinus we know enough about the Egyptian vague year to

<sup>1</sup> See Wilcken *Griechische Ostraka* i. 786 ff. It is to be observed that in our horoscope the fixed date gives the *previous* day, in *Brit. Mus. Pap.* cxxx. the *subsequent*, both in Roman and Augustan reckoning, but it is added that this day was *ἐπιφωσκούση*.

make this certain. Either then a day's difference was set between the Julian and Augustan calendars at a revision about 112 years before the Sothic began in 139 A.D., or the intercalated day in the Augustan calendar was inserted 30 months after the Julian bissextile, e.g. in August 14 A.D.<sup>2</sup> This, however, appears to contradict *Oxyr. Papyr.* I. 45. 17.

T. NICKLIN.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Classical Review*, vol. xiv. Pp. 146-8.

## NOTES.

ON A FRAGMENT OF CHRYSIPPUS.—In Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*, vii. 3, we read: 'in libro enim *περὶ προνοίας* quarto *ἐμπαρμένη* esse dicit (sc. Chrysippus) *φυσικὴν τινα σύνταξιν τῶν ὅλων ἐξ αἰδίου τῶν ἐτέρων τοῖς ἐτέροις ἐπακολουθούντων καὶ μετὰ πολὺ μὲν οὖν ἀπαραβάτων οὐσῶν τῆς τοιαύτης ἐπιπλοκῆς.*'

Instead of the corrupt *μετὰ πολὺ μὲν οὖν* Zeller (*Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. p. 157, note 2) suggests *ἐπιπλοκομένην*. It is clear that a participle is needed, but *ἐπιπλοκομένην* has little probability. So obvious a word as *ἐπιπλοκομένην* would not be readily corrupted, and even if it were, could scarcely change into *μετὰ πολὺ μὲν οὖν*.

I venture to suggest *μεταπολλυμένην*, with the sense of 'perishing after.' The unfamiliar compound—*μεταπόλλυμι* is not quoted in Stephanus-Hase—would easily lend itself to corruption, and the meaning appears to be suitable. Fate may well be defined as a *φυσικὴ σύνταξις τῶν ὅλων*, 'one set of events succeeding the other from all eternity and perishing after their predecessors.'

J. ADAM.

### ON DIONYSII HALICARNASEI DE THUCYDIDIS IDIOMATIS EPISTULA.

iii. (793, 15 K): *ἐπιλογισμός*.—The conjecture *ἐπηλύτης*, although supported by Marcellinus 52, is not easy. It is less difficult to suppose that Dionysius wrote *ἐπιδημιουργός* (Thuc. i. 56), a word that is certainly *γλωσσηματικόν*, since it has given rise to various scholia, e.g. δ' *Ἀσκληπιάδης τὴν ἐπιπρόθεσιν περιττὴν εἶναι λέγει*.—*ὄνομα ἀρχῆς δ' ἐπιδημιουργός* *παρὰ Κορινθίους*.

ix. (799, 1): *οὐ καθ' ἑνὸς λέγεσθαι περὶ κασιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πολλῶν*.—These words, which Herwerden, following B, omitted, are retained by Usener, who regards them as the comment on another Thucydidean example supposed to be lost from the text. But that they belong with the first part of the chapter is evident, since it is there that the substitution of the singular for the natural plural is under consideration; and inasmuch as the accepted text gives adequate explanations of that point, the words may be rejected as a gloss.

WINIFRED WARREN.

On the first of the passages treated above it may be worth while to observe that we are not compelled to decide between the rival palaeographical claims of *ἐπηλύτης* and *ἐπιδημιουργός*. Nearer than either to

the tradition would be *ἐπιθειασμός*, Thuc. 7. 75. 4 in the plural. The word would be *γλωσσηματικόν* to Dionysius, as for him the verb would have the sense of 'inspiring'; cf. *Ant. Rom.* 1. 31. 3.

J. P. P.

ἡμιτελής IN LUCIAN.—Whatever may be the meaning of *ἡμιτελής* in Il. ii. 701, cited by Mr. Bayfield (*C.R.*, xv. p. 447), there can, I think, be no doubt that Lucian in the passage also cited (*D. Mort.* xix. i.) intended it to mean 'half-finished.' The other passages where he uses the word seem to make this clear.

*Catapl.* 8. The dead Megapenthes is asking Clotho to allow him to return to the upper world. ΚΑΘΘ. *Τί δὲ ἔστιν οὐ χάριν ἀφικέσθαι θέλεις; ΜΕΓ. τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκτελέσαι μοι πρότερον ἐπίτρεψόν· ἡμιτελής γάρ δ' ὄδμος καταλείπεται.*

In this passage it may be noted that the fact that the house was 'without its master' would be no reason for granting the request made by Megapenthes *πρὸς ὀλίγον ἀνελεθῆναι*.

*Sacr.* 5. *τὸν μὲν γὰρ Διόνυσον ἡμιτελῆ, φασίν, ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς ἔτι καιομένης ἀρπάσας κ.τ.λ.* (the uncompleted, half-finished Dionysus).

*Icarom.* 14. *ὥς νῦν γε ἡμιτελής ἀφίγμαι.* (Menippus is regretting that he has only provided himself with an eagle's wing, and has not substituted an eagle's eyes for his own).

HERBERT W. GREENE.

SAYING OF ALEXANDER: RESERVE THE ONE EAR FOR THE PARTY CALUMNIATED.—I do not doubt that this striking saying occurs in other authors. I have only taken note of it in Basil.

*Epist.* 24 fin. (III 103 c, ed. Bened.): *ἀκούοντες δὲ πάντως, εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο, τὸ γοῦν τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου ποιήσομεν, τὴν ἑτέραν τῶν ἀκοῶν ἀκραίαν ταμיעῖσθαι τῷ διαβαλλομένῳ.*

*ibidem* *epist.* 244 2 (p. 377 c) *ἡμῶν μὲν μακρὰν ἀφικισμένων, τῶν δὲ ψευδολόγων ἔγγυθεν ἐχόντων ταῖς καθ' ἡμῶν διαβολαῖς καρδίαν εὐκαταγώνιστον, καὶ οὐ διδασμένην τὴν ἑτέραν τῶν ἀκοῶν ἀκραίαν φυλάττειν τῷ μὴ παρόντι.*

In *epistle* 199 canon 29 (p. 294 d) correct a corruption due to dittography. *εἰ τις ὁμώσειν ἐνετορῶσειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ.* Read *ἐξορῶσειν*.

*Basil ep.* 94 fin. *ἵνα δὲ μὴ τὸν πρὸ τῆς συντυχίας*



χρόνον ταῖς διαβολαῖς τινων ὀπαχθεῖς, ὀφείναι τι τῆς περὶ ἡμᾶς εὐνοίας ἀναγκασθῆς, τὸ τοῦ 'Αλεξάνδρου ποίησον' καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνόν φασι, διαβαλλομένου τινος τῶν συνήθων, τὴν μὲν ἑτέραν τῶν ἀκοῶν ἀνεῖναι τῷ διαβάλλοντι, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν ἐπιμελῶς ἐπιφράσασθαι τῇ χειρὶ. ἐνδεικνύμενον, ὅτι δέοι τὸν ὁρθῶς κρίνειν μέλλοντα, μὴ ὅλον εὖθὺς τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν ἀπάγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἥμισυ τῆς ἀκρόατος ἀκείρισον διασώζειν πρὸς ἀπολογία τῷ μὴ παρόντι.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

CICERO *Ep. ad Att.* xiii. 23. 2.—Libri ad Varonem non morabantur. Sunt enim † defecti, ut vidisti: tantum librorum menda tolluntur.

Various suggestions have been made for the corrupt *defecti*, amongst others *defecti*, *descripti*, *effecti*, *refecti*, *delecti*, *adfecti*. Of these *delecti*, the conjecture of Lambinus, is the least unsatisfactory and is adopted by Tyrrell and Purser in their edition of the Letters. I propose to read *defaecti*. We thus get a good Plautine word, which would certainly have been corrupted, and which seems regularly to have been used of literary revision, cf. Sidon. Apoll. I. 1. 3: sed scilicet tibi parui tuaeque examinationi has <litterulas> non recensendas (hoc enim parum est) sed defaecandas, ut aiunt, limandasque commisi, sciens te immodicum esse fautorem non studiorum modo verum etiam studiosorum.

GEORGE W. MOONEY.

ON HORACE, ODES III. AND IV

iii. 4, 49. magnum illa terrorem intulerat Jovi...  
It has often been noted that this stanza 'mars the

effect of the picture of imperial calm.' In fact the current interpretation ruins the passage. Is it not possible to take away the point at the end of the stanza and explain *intulerat* as a rhetorical substitute for *intulisset*? The protasis would naturally follow in the form *nisi nil potuissent* or *possent*, but its place is taken by the rhetorical question, *quid possent*. In the Odes the pluperfect subjunctive is not found in the apodosis, its place being taken by the pluperfect indicative, e.g. iii. 16, 3. In cases where a corresponding affirmation would be in the imperfect indicative Horace uses the imperfect subjunctive in the apodosis. Thus in iv. 6, 19, *ureret* suggests *urebat*, 'he was for burning,' 'was the man to burn.' Cf. iii. 14, 27.

iv. 11, 3. apium.

There can, I think, be little doubt that the *apium* of the Augustan poets is not parsley but wild celery, *apium graveolens*. Parsley will not suit Virgil's habitat for the plant, and Virgil is exactly supported by Dioscorides, who places the *apium rusticum* of the Romans in watery ground. The only argument adduced against wild celery is that the stiff leaves of this plant could not be used for wreaths. But they were. A wreath found on a mummy near Thebes (Egypt) in 1885 is composed of the leaves of this plant tied on to strips of papyrus and interspersed with petals and buds of *Nymphaea caerulea*. The leaves are not twisted but stand out from the papyrus strips, as vine leaves stand out from the *philyra* or like material in the wreaths of Dionysus. By the kindness of Mr. Anthony Gepp and Professor Meurer I have just seen a photograph of this beautiful wreath. The original is, I believe, at Rome.

J. SARGAUNT.

## REVIEWS.

### MONRO'S *ODYSSEY* XIII.-XXIV.

*Homér's Odyssey.* xiii.-xxiv. Edited with English notes and appendices, by D. B. MONRO, M.A., Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. Pp. 512. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

EVERY student of the Homeric poems will welcome the appearance of this volume. It is a work worthy of the University from which it proceeds and of the scholar, who has already contributed much to the exact knowledge of the language of the Greek epic by his *Homeric Grammar* and other publications. The University of Glasgow, it may be noted, receives the compliment of the dedication.

The text and commentary occupy nearly 300 pages, and although Mr. Monro's annotations are in general terse and full of matter, the product of careful and keen

consideration, it is for that reason the more to be regretted that he did not allow himself at least another hundred pages for this section of his labours. Even then he would have fallen short of the number of pages, considerably over 500, taken up by the first twelve books and commentary in the earlier volume, of which this is the continuation and completion. It cannot be said that this economy of space is due to the existence of the work referred to, and has been rendered possible because of any free reference to its pages; for beyond a complimentary reference to the note on γ 315, little direct use seems to be made of the previous volume. Still this regrettable brevity has its compensation in the interesting and valuable appendices, six in number, for which the author has so been able to find accommodation pp. 289-501. We have also no

less than eighteen illustrations, of which the striking and pretty view of the Old Harbour of Corfu (p. 19), the comical naval battle (p. 95), the Icelandic Hall (p. 218), and the Homeric axe-heads (p. 176) may be mentioned as interesting and valuable. The last named indeed could hardly be dispensed with, if any definite idea of the nature of the contest proposed by Penelope is to be formed by the reader. The subjects of the appendices, which form so substantial a part of the book, are: 1. The Composition of the Odyssey. 2. The Relation of the Odyssey to the Iliad. 3. Homer and the Cyclic poets. 4. The History of the Homeric Poems. 5. The Time and Place of Homer, and 6. The Homeric House.

In discussing the Composition of the Odyssey Mr. Monro marks the predominance of the folk-lore element over that of heroic legend. The folk-lore tales (*Märchen*) belong he says to the realm of pure fancy, to an imaginary time and place. But the severance from semi-historical tradition seems scarcely so absolute as he would make it. To take one of the instances he adduces, it has been said and it seems indisputable, that *Laestrygonia* is only an obscured tradition of a Norwegian Fiord and the Land of the Midnight Sun, belonging to a time and place not so much imaginary as forgotten.

Nothing could, I think, be more admirable than the mode in which Mr. M. demonstrates the necessity for the appearance of Telemachus in the Odyssey in opposition to the view that 'the Telemachia,' as it is called, is either an independent poem or an enlargement inserted by a different author. Excellent too is the explanation and justification of the second council of the gods (ε 1-42). Still Mr. M. is not entirely conservative. He does not accept as genuine the whole of the Odyssey, as we have received it from tradition. He rejects absolutely the song of Demodocus, part of the description of the Gardens of Alcinoüs (ll. 103-131), the concluding portion of the *Nékyia* (λ 565-627) and from ψ 297 to the end of the poem.

In App. iv. the examination and refutation of the ordinary conception of the Homeridae as a clan claiming descent from Homer or as a society of professional rhapsodists, whereas the term merely implies students and admirers of the Homeric poems, is interesting and important. Even more so is the argument by which Pistratus and his alleged collection of the scattered poetry of Homer are, unless I am

much mistaken, finally disposed of. Pistratus gets a great fall, and whoever undertakes to set him on the wall again will have enough to do. *Sudet multum frustra que labore.*

Then we have a review of the literary criticism of the poems, which commenced with Antimachus at the end of the fifth century. A very high encomium is bestowed on Aristotle in this connection, though the story of his Iliad of the Casket is properly dismissed as 'a picturesque myth.' In the section dealing with the question of the antiquity of the vulgate text and with the various forms of interpolation, which have interfered with its integrity, we have a mass of well-ordered learning and criticism. Perhaps I may be allowed to take exception to one argument. It is inferred with respect to a Homeric quotation (Ψ 77-92) in Aeschines, that because it was read by the Clerk of the Court (*γραμματεὺς*) and not spoken by the orator himself, we have therefore no security that the words really come from Aeschines at all. But this objection would only hold good, if the *γραμματεὺς* edited the speech afterwards, or if we had a verbatim report taken down by some one present at the trial. If Aeschines published his own speech, he must be held responsible for any quotation it may contain. Two general conclusions are reached. 1. That previous to the time of the Alexandrine critics the text had suffered much from interpolation. 2. At the same time copies existed not greatly different from our vulgate. Then follows a favourable estimate of the services rendered by Aristarchus, who besides his merits as a textual critic is credited with having interpreted obsolete words, maintained correct inflexions, noted the historical environment, the geography, the antiquities, the customs &c. and with having shown throughout 'a supremely rational spirit.'

In the next essay, 'The Time and Place of Homer,' we have a concise summary of the chief features of the Homeric Dialect and a few of the restorations of the original forms are given. Mr. Monro is undoubtedly right in saying that no restoration of the text can be complete; but yet it by no means follows, as we might almost suppose he means to recommend, that we should refrain from removing modernisations, even flagrant ones, because we cannot hope to resuscitate the primitive forms in their totality. For instance we have probably in all texts, certainly in all MSS., *κατ'ἑκαστα* (π 290), though it is quite certain that the

only admissible form is *κατρείκισται* (Herwerden), the simple verb being *δείκω* not as afterwards *αἰκίζω*. A correction of this kind is quite a different matter from writing *πάνς* for *πᾶς*, *τόνς* for *τοῖς* or even *τᾶος* or *τῆος* for *τεῶς*, &c., which forms might with great advantage be confined to the obscurity of a note.

In dealing with the Homeric house Mr. M. argues very effectively for the existence of one threshold only to the *μέγαρον*, showing the practical identity of the *λαῖνος* and the *μέλιнос οὔδος*, that in fact the two thresholds belong to the same doorway.

If we turn to the consideration of the text, a considerable advance will be found here on the editor's Oxford Homer of 1896. A few examples may be mentioned to make this clear. We have now:—

ν 194 *ἄλλοειδέ' ἐφαίνετο* (an emendation first made by Payne Knight) for *ἄλλοειδέα φανέσκοντο*. ν 400 *ἄνθρωπον* for *ἄνθρωπος*, a distinct improvement. ο 453 *περάσσαιτε* for the impossible *περάσητε*. π 206 *ἦλθον* *εἰκοστῶ* for *ἦλθον* *εἰκοστῶ*. 317 *νηλεΐδες* for *νηλίδες*. 369 *φθίσαιμεν* for *φθίσωμεν*. ρ 60 *τελέσαι* for *τελέσση*. 81 *ἔχοντα* *σέ* for *ἔχοντά* *σε*. 222 *ἄορά γ'* for *ἄορας*. τ 539 *αἰχέν' ἔαξε* for the absurd *αἰχένας ἦξε*. 586 *ἀμφαφύοντας* for *ἀμφαφύοντας*. υ 138 *μυμήσκοντο* for *μυμνήσκοιτο*. 315 *εἰ* *δὴ μὴ μ'* for *εἰ δ' ἤδη μ'*, perhaps a questionable change. 383 *πέμψωμεν* for *πέμψωμεν*. ψ 206 *ἀναγνούσης* for *ἀναγνύσσης*.

For these and other similar improvements Mr. Monro merits all praise; nor are we under less obligation to him for many valuable contributions in the notes to the better understanding of the text. I may refer to the note on *λυκάβας* (ξ 158-62), the new and ingenious explanation of ο 156-8, the examination and redistribution of ο 294-8, the new version suggested for ρ 413 *προικὸς γένεσθαι Ἀχαιῶν* (But would not *γένεσθαι* be required?), the note on ο 555 *προβιβάντα*. In τ 37 we have a new explanation of *μεσόδμυ* 'the stone bases of the wooden pillars' supporting the *μέγαρον*. This seems highly probable in itself; but the order of the enumeration *τοίχοι—μεσόδμυ—δοκοί—κίονες* seems peculiar. In ψ 243 *περάτη* is explained as 'passage,' a new view possessing strong claims to acceptance. I have some doubt about the proposed version of χ 14. It seems hardly natural enough for Homer. 'Who would expect a man to commit suicide by murdering another, who had all his friends about him?' is the question according to Mr. Monro, the implication

being that the murderer would be lynched on the spot. This might be taken from a modern writer, but is it quite like Homer?

If I now proceed to mention sundry points, in which I am unable to agree with Mr. Monro, I do so with a full and cordial recognition of the many great merits and high quality of this edition. In ν 34 I find the statement that for *βλάβεται* 'it is always possible to read *βλάβετο*.' This can only be so, if we take no account of metrical equivalence. In ν 91 *μνέσθ'* is required for *μνᾶσθαι*. Mr. M. rightly points out that in l. 41 the metre is defective. Here it is so in a higher degree. In ξ 296 the local sense attributed to *ἴνα* seems doubtful. ξ 406 *πρόφρων κεν δὴ ἔπειτα Δία Κρονίωνα λιτοίμην*. Mr. M. renders this 'I would be fain thereupon to entreat Zeus' (*sc. Ζεὺς ξείνιος*) i.e. to make my peace with him. I submit that the true sense of the words is with strong irony: 'I should be very eager forsooth after such a deed to say a prayer to Zeus.' Eumaeus means he would have qualms about praying to Zeus. Neither of Mr. Monro's arguments avails here. *πρόφρων*, he says, implies *eagerness* to do something, not *confidence* in doing it. Granted: but then that is precisely what E. wishes to convey by his ironical remark 'I shall not be in any hurry to pray.' He would in fact be rather shy about saying a prayer to Zeus, and would be inclined to pray to any god rather than to Zeus *ξείνιος*. Nor again in this rendering is the force of the aor. neglected. The present would mean 'to say my prayers habitually': the aor. 'to breathe a single prayer.' Now if we compare the two versions, the one I have given and Mr. M.'s, it is plain that the present would suit his new version better than it does mine:— 'I should be fain thereupon to make many prayers to Zeus, to entreat Zeus many a time and oft.' He would importune Zeus with incessant prayers for forgiveness. The other version, which has the advantage of maintaining the irony of l. 402, is on the contrary made more effective by the aor. He would not say a single word that might draw the attention of Zeus to his case.

In ο 21 Mr. M. desiderates as a preliminary the restoration of the *F* of *οἶκον*. Surely P. Knight's *κείνοιο οἶκον βούλετ'* is good enough and probable enough.

ο 373 is clearly nothing but an interpolation.

ο 524. It is eminently desirable, and indeed only reasonable, that *τελευτήσῃ* and similar forms should be recognised not only as future indicatives, but also as the correct

archaic forms of the non-thematic aor. subj. This would apply to ἀρκέσει (π 261) ἀλύξει (τ 558).

π 10. I suggest that ὑπό is here adverbial with the sense of 'faintly,' 'indistinctly.' The sound is subdued or muffled. The barking of the dogs makes it impossible to hear it very clearly; but like the *motif* in a piece of music it may be detected in the midst of the louder harmonies.

π 19. I am strongly inclined to believe that τηλύγετον is merely an erroneous tradition of τηύγετον cf. our shamefast and shame-faced.

π 195. ἡ κυκλική deserves much credit for preserving what is certainly the true reading here θέλγεις.

ρ 218. A manifest interpolation. That such a line ever came from the lips of the author of the *Odyssey* is a downright impossibility. The use of the article τὸν ὁμοῖον—τὸν ὁμοῖον is as informing as the Attic preposition.

ρ 387. τρύξοντα ἔ αὐτόν was probably ζφε γ' αὐτόν. The emphasis given by γε is quite justified by the sense here. Contrast Ξ 162 where no such emphasis exists. That the particle should have disappeared is only natural. In face of the later ἐαυτόν it could hardly be preserved. In θ 396 δέ ἔ αὐτόν should rather be δ' ἔε γ' αὐτίς.

ρ 447. οὕτως is in my view far better explained as indicating a place at some distance from the speaker.

ρ 484. The apodosis is virtually in the voc. οὐλόμενε, O lost one, if etc. This form of expression is quite natural in English.

ρ 586. I should much prefer to read the line thus:—

οὐκ ἄφρων τὸ ξείνος δέεται, ὥς περ ἂν εἴη.  
'The stranger—no fool he—thinks of this just as it would be.' To join ἄφρων with δέεται more closely than this merely begs the question.

σ 3. I am afraid that ἀζηχῆς still remains a riddle unsolved. The insuperable difficulty for etymologists in many cases is that the ancients in transmitting an obsolete word practised no machine-like accuracy, and never scrupled to make a modification that seemed to them to simplify matters, to bring the word a degree nearer to the comprehension of their own day, e.g. τηλύγετος.

σ 408. κατακείετε as fut. indic.—not imperative—needs some consideration. Surely we have to deal with 'a direct request,' and that is why the apology of the next line is needed.

τ 159. κατεδόντων. This is perhaps best explained as a 'causal genitive' with ἀσχαλάα.

υ 23. ἐν πείσῃ. The other explanation of this unique word, 'obedience' should at least be mentioned. That the phrase means 'in bondage' is hard to believe.

υ 83. ἔχει. If the first interpretation, that of Faesi, be right, as Mr. M. declares, why does he end by suggesting ἔπει? The traditional reading both here and in μ 209, which he refers to, is decidedly the best. All that is necessary in the latter place is to restore the true order of the words τὸδ' ἔπει μῶλλον κακόν.

υ 106. ἦατο rather suggests that the mills were placed on trestles or stands like our sewing-machines.

υ 224. δόμαι takes an acc. without any such objective clause as here follows, e.g. N 283 etc.

υ 273. There seems to be a double meaning here. Ostensibly Antinous says:— 'Zeus does not allow us to do otherwise than be silent under his rebuke; otherwise we should have answered and confuted him.' The veiled meaning is of course:— 'we should have killed him before now.'

φ 26. Perhaps the curious ἐπίστωρ means 'one who goes in quest of,' the whole forming an apt description of a knight-errant.

φ 50. I cannot regard the explanation of σανίδος as at all probable.

χ 126. Possibly ὀροθύρη may mean a swing-door, or if not, a staircase-door.

χ 219. βίαις is a very strange word here and certainly requires some comment.

χ 408. εἶσατο is a very excellent suggestion.

ψ 3. I would suggest ἐριγμαίνοντο as possibly concealed under ἐρικταίνοντο. It would meet the requirements of the passage well enough.

ψ 16. Instead of ἐρέουσα read ἐνέπουσα and the difficulty disappears.

ψ 316. In the original possibly:—

οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ ἐ φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἰκέσθαι  
αἶσ' ἦν (K αἶην rather points to this).

ω 8. ἐκ πέτρης I should say depends certainly on ὀρμαθοῦ and not in any degree on the verb.

ω 128. May not ἄλλον be explained here by reference to the previous line, so that the meaning would be 'other than the design to have us removed altogether,' ἡμῖν φραζομένη θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν?

ω 240. I can hardly agree that this line is the only real exception to the rule men-



tioned. What is the unreality about E 734, to take only one example?

ω 343. This line may be looked upon as an interpolation introduced by some one, who was not pleased to see *διατρίγιος* δὲ *ἑκαστος* without a verb.

I will conclude with the following list of desiderata for the editor's kindly consideration: χ 12 *οἶοιτο* for *οἶοιτο*, ω 67 *νῶι* for

*νῶιν*, τ 215 *ξείνος* not *ξείνε* for *ξείνέ γ'*, φ 434 note on *κεκορυθμένος*, ω 67 *ἐν ἐσθῇ* without the superfluous τ', φ 125 *τανύσσεισθαι* (Jordan) for *ἐρύσσεισθαι*, ρ 322 *ἀπαμείρεται* for *ἀποαίνυται*. ω 485 *θείομεν* (*θήομεν*) *ἔκλυσιν* for *ἔκλυσιν θέομεν*, unless he is prepared to stand by *θείομεν*. In τ 579 I am glad to see *ἄμα σποίμην* for the usual *ἄμ' ἐσποίμην*.

T. L. AGAR.

#### CESAREO'S ANTIGONE OF SOPHOCLES.

*Sofocle: 'Antigone,'* con note di PLACIDO CESAREO; Torino (Loescher). 1901.

If any considerable number of Italian editions of the Classics can be compared with this, scholarship in that country leaves little to be desired. The purposed scope of the editor's work may be given in his own words:—'Ho procurato di rendere ai giovani il senso intimo d'ogni passo (o, quando ce ne poteva esser più d'uno, tutti quanti con le rispettive difese dei vari sostenitori), discutendo, vagliando, scegliendo quello che mi pareva il migliore; insomma mi sono attenuto a un'analisi il più che da noi si poteva scrupolosa, non diremo già fine... Ma ciò a cui abbiamo dato il miglior posto è appunto l'arte; chè non s'abbia a dire una tragedia di Sofocle si possa intenderla senza apprezzarla nel suo senso estetico e gustarla. Abbiamo quindi, volta a volta, notato le figure, le immagini, i concetti, la posizione delle parole nel periodo e nel metro, tutte le leggi generali e le anomalie peculiari, le quali formano la bellezza dei vari luoghi, o vi contribuiscono.'

This comprehensive design Sig. Cesareo has carried out with admirable success. His scholarship is accurate, and he shows a literary and dramatic taste superior to that of several of his predecessors in the same

field. An acquaintance at first hand with the works of English and German editors has enabled him to take a comprehensive view of all points of difficulty, and his judgment is, in the present writer's opinion, rarely at fault. His style is clear and concise; and if the few translations which are given are somewhat lacking in distinction (senza caratteristico distintivo), this is perhaps due to a desire to make them as literal as possible. In the result, we have a commentary which is at once thorough, appreciative, and scholarly, and which Italian teachers and students should hail with satisfaction. If boys are meant to be included under the term 'giovani,' the notes should be relieved of a good deal of matter which can have no interest for them,—in particular, the frequently recurring lists of editors' names, and the enumeration of untenable and improbable views. There are many points and passages on which Sig. Cesareo would be quite safe in simply giving his own opinion. Also there should be a good deal of translation (not literal) into Italian of the best literary style. The editor has already before him an unsurpassable model in the translations of Prof. Jebb, the first appearance of which marked an epoch in English classical scholarship.

M. A. BAYFIELD.

#### MARCHANT'S XENOPHON.

*Xenophontis Opera Omnia* recognovit E. C. MARCHANT. Tomus II. Commentarii, Oeconomicus, Convivium, Apologia Socratis. Oxonii.

MR. MARCHANT has brought out the second volume of his useful *Xenophon*. Like

Schenk's second volume (1876), which it much resembles, (I hope it will not resemble it in being the last), it contains the *libri Socratici*. It is very convenient to have these together in one fairly handy volume. Using as I understand mainly the collations of other scholars, but making himself well

acquainted with the literature of the subject, Mr. Marchant has produced a very serviceable and at this time of writing no doubt the best text. In accordance with the principles of the series in which it appears it is strictly conservative in the actual text adopted, but in the brief critical notes he has mentioned many certain or probable conjectures. I should have been glad to see rather more of these, for they add considerably to the usefulness of the book. In *Mem.* 3. 5. 6 for instance, it is quite certain that *ἔστ' ἂν...δείσωσιν* cannot be right in the sense of *when* or *as long as they fear*, and Coraes' suggestion that *ἔστ' ἂν* should change places with *ὅταν* in the line before ought to be given. In 2. 1. 24 *ἀὶ ἔσθ' ἴσθ' ἴσθ'* surely should be mentioned among the emendations of *δείσθ'*, and in 4. 4. 16 it should be noted that many critics propose to insert a substantive, which seems sadly wanted, after *τοῖς αὐτοῖς*. In *Oecon.* 8. 4 one would expect to find Zeune's *ἀγλευκίστατον* for *ἀκλειστάτον* mentioned along with, or in preference to, Wytttenbach's *ἀρθέστατον*, just as Orelli's *ἀγλευκός* is duly given a few lines before. There are some places too, where perhaps no plausible change has been proposed, but which cannot be right as they stand (e.g. *Symp.* 8. 4.), in which the editor gives no indication that the text is not perfectly satisfactory. He has however put a like restraint on his own conjectural powers, for the suggestions he makes are extremely few and trifling. It may be noted here that in

*Mem.* 1. 4. 1, though *ὥς* is supported by the papyrus fragment, *οἷς* is a quite certain restoration, as various scholars have seen. This bears upon the value of papyri.

It is no doubt outside the plan of the series to enter upon discussions as to genuineness, interpolations, and so on. At the same time it would have been useful and interesting even to the ordinary reader to have some indications of the extensive proposals for purging the *Memorabilia* and also the *Oeconomicus* of alleged accretions. Such an account need not have been as minute as that of Gilbert in his preface to the *Memorabilia*, but the bare statement in Mr. Marchant's preface that there have been such proposals is hardly enough. When too a good scholar has given as much time to a book as the preparation of such a text implies, one would be glad to have his opinion on the general question, if not on details. I am pleased to see that Mr. Marchant seems to accept the *Apology* as genuine.

Besides one or two other misprints (e.g. *Symp.* 4. 49 *Νῆ Δί', ἔφη, ὁ Σωκράτης* for *Νῆ Δί', ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης*, a misprint which is taken over straight from Dindorf) there is one in the mention of an emendation of my own. In the corrupt words *τῷ Νικίου τοῦ ἐπηλύτου ἱππῷ* (*Oecon.* 11. 4.) I had conjectured *τῷ ἐπηλύτῳ*. By some error this appears in Mr. Marchant's note as *τῷ ἱππηλύτῳ*, which readers will find puzzling.

H. RICHARDS.

#### PANTAZIDES' ANABASIS AND GEMOLL'S LEXICON TO XENOPHON.

*Ξενοφώντος συγγράμματα.* Edited by I. PANTAZIDES. Vol. I.—*Anabasis*. Athens, Sakellarios, 1900. Pp. 646. Price 10 francs.

THIS finely printed book, published under the auspices of the Greek Philological Society of Constantinople, is quite an *édition de luxe*. The chief aim of the series to which it belongs is to satisfy the wants of ordinary Greek readers of the Classics who have not capacity or leisure *πρὸς τελείαν κατάληψιν τῶν θαυμασίων ἔργων τοῦ δαμονίου πνεύματος τῶν προγόνων*. Sixty-six pages of *prolegomena* dealing with the life of Xenophon and other matters give a useful summary of the literature of the subject. The text is furnished with a brief, but adequate

*apparatus criticus* and an eminently business-like commentary, which, though designed for the 'general reader,' contains many notes superior to any I have come across in other editions of the *Anabasis*. In textual matters Dr. Pantazides is a conservative. It is refreshing to find an editor of Xenophon nowadays who has not fallen under the influence of Cobet and his admirers; for surely no author has fared as badly as Xenophon at the hands of some of his critics, who have ruthlessly corrected many of his deviations from the strict Attic standard of accidence and syntax, or, like Hartman, have found *insulsa emblemata* everywhere. Writing as long ago as 1858, Dr. Pantazides pointed out the need of caution in this respect, *μήποτε τὰ ζιζάνια*

συνάλλγοντες ἐκρίζωσωμεν ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σίτον, and now he says:—ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἐτι πολὺ μᾶλλον φρονοῦμεν καὶ διακηρύττομεν, βλέποντες μετὰ πόσης τόλμης οἱ νεώτεροι τῶν κριτικῶν φέρονται πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις χωρίων ἀσφαλῶς καθ' ἡμᾶς γνησίων προϊόντων τοῦ Ξενοφοντίου καλᾶμον. For scholars the most valuable part of this edition is the appendix of 200 pages dealing at some length with a large number of important passages, which are handled with the good sense for which the whole book is remarkable.

*Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis Hellenica und Memorabilien.* By W. GEMOLL. Leipzig, Freytag, 1901. Pp. 340. Price 4 M.

DR. GEMOLL is well known as an editor of Xenophon. His clearly arranged and admirably illustrated lexicon is noteworthy as an indication that the German schoolboys of the twentieth century are to be pampered like our own. The pictures, over ninety in number, are very well selected, and there are two good maps. It is worth noticing that neither Dr. Gemoll nor Dr. Pantazides have availed themselves of Prof. W. M. Ramsay's researches in Asia Minor (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vols. iv. and viii.) for their maps of the Route of the Ten Thousand; the situation of Keramon Agora should certainly be altered.

G. M. EDWARDS.

#### PRAECHTER'S HIEROCLES THE STOIC.

*Hierokles der Stoiker.* Von KARL PRAECHTER. Leipzig, Dieterich. 1901.

This book is intended to prove that the quotations given by Stobaeus from Hierocles do not belong to the Neo-Platonic writer of that name but to a philosopher of the Stoic school. Whether this was the same as the author of the phrase ἡδονὴ τέλος πόρνης δόγμα, cited as 'verba Hieroclis Stoici viri sancti et gravis,' by Gellius (9. 5. 8) is regarded by Herr Praechter as doubtful; but he considers that there is much more to be said for the identification of the philosopher quoted by Stobaeus with another philosopher named Hierocles of Hyllarima in Caria who began life as an athlete, and who must as being entitled 'of Hyllarima' have lived before the days of Hadrian, who refounded that city under the name of Hadrianopolis. The passage from Stephanus Byzantinus in which this Carian Hierocles is mentioned has been thought to be derived from the treatise of Philo περὶ πόλεων καὶ

οὓς ἐκάστη ἐνδόξους ἤνεγκε. The argument of Herr Praechter takes the form of a careful investigation of the views on various leading subjects attributed to the Hierocles of Stobaeus, and the conclusion arrived at is that they differ on the whole from those of the Neo-Platonic Hierocles: though it is admitted that on certain points, specially in what is said of duty to parents (p. 53) and of luxury in the furnishing of houses (p. 90), there is a close parallel. On p. 89, l. 3 there appears to be a misprint of HS. (Hierokles der Stoiker) for HN. (Hierokles der Neo-platoniker). The supposition of Bock quoted on p. 123 who 'beide' (viz. Jerome and Hugh of St. Victor) 'auf eine gemeinsame Quelle, Tertullian de nupt. angust. zurückführt,' is improbable. Is there any reason to believe that Hugh did not depend wholly, as is scarcely doubtful in the case of John of Salisbury in the next generation, upon Jerome for the Theophrastean discussion of matrimony?

C. C. J. WEBB.

#### GOW'S HORACE, SATIRES I.

*Horace, Satires I.* Edited by JAMES GOW, Litt. D., Head Master of Westminster: Cambridge University Press, 1901.

DR. GOW here gives us not only an excellent schoolbook but a very considerable contri-

bution to our knowledge of the Satires. The merits of the late Arthur Palmer's edition are not quite such as fit it for teaching purposes, but Dr. Gow's notes are models of perspicuity and provide neither too much nor too little. Where they run to

some length, as on the difficult passage 6. 7-22, they throw light on the darkness. In this passage Dr. Gow has not only found a consistent and reasonable explanation of the text but also achieved the even more difficult task of understanding and stating in an intelligible form the view taken by Orelli.

The lines in which the text differs from recent editions are not very many, but although some of the readings may not ultimately stand, it is distinctly in advance of its predecessors. In 3. 10 we have Dr. Postgate's *si* for *qui*, and this correction will surely be accepted as certain. The same corrector's *et quantis* for *atque aliis* in 6. 111, is less convincing, though the MSS. text is undoubtedly corrupt. In 3. 103, Dr. Gow accepts Professor Housman's transposition of *voce* and *sensus*, getting the sense which long ago Fröhlich vainly endeavoured to extract from the MSS. readings. In 5. 15, the omission of *ut*, supported by some MSS., is in all ways an improvement. In 6. 14 Dr. Gow will not have *notante*, and his own suggestion of *quid autem* seems to deserve more attention than he ventures to claim for it. In 3. 120-121 he successfully defends the text against Palmer's unhappy *nunc vereor* and others. Now that it is well established that *non vereor ut* for *non vereor ne non* is not sound Latin, there should be no difficulty in taking *ut caedas* as a substantival clause. Indeed, as the clause precedes the main verb, it is hard to see how a living sense of the Latin could ever find any difficulty in the passage. In 6. 126, Munro's *pulsum* for *lusum* is perhaps unnecessary. In face of such a construction as *ludere aleam, ludere par impar*, the construction here seems to be the same as in *post ignem aetheria domo | subductum* and *memor mutatas togas*. This view must, however, assume that *trigon* may mean the game as well as the ball.

On 5. 38, Dr. Gow suggests that the journey to Brindisi is commemorated by the ode on Murena's augurship. The journey can hardly have taken place earlier in the year than February, while the ode (3. 19) seems to refer to January. Possibly, however, even at Formiae a north wind in February might make a man shiver with Paelignian cold

'fremeret saeva cum grandine vernus Juppiter.'

On 5. 16 Dr. Gow's suggestion that *viator* is not a passenger on the boat but a traveller on the towpath is strongly supported by the contrast between *viator* and *navita* in *Car.* III. 4. 30-32.

I will note a few trivial points on which I venture to disagree. It is not quite accurate to say that 'Caesar's park ... was ... a good way down the river from the Pons Sublicius,' and the apparent implication that Horace would cross by that bridge to see his sick friend, real or imaginary, can hardly be accepted. He would probably cross by the Pons Aemilius and so by the Lungaretta and up the Janiculum. Dr. Gow states somewhat too roundly that 'the construction *dignus qui* does not occur in Augustan poets,' but it is true that in the one notable exception, *Aeneid* vii. 653, there is a special reason for its adoption. In 4. 23 we cannot actually understand *mei*, for *scripta mei* will hardly stand. How often it happens that the word of the ellipse is not definitely conceived. On 4. 63 would it not be more accurate to say that Cicero's usual formula is not *hactenus haec* but *haec hactenus*? In 2. 8 the metaphor of *stringat* is as likely to be from gathering fruit or reaping ears of corn as from stripping leaves off trees. I will only add that Dr. Gow's edition is one which no Horatian will choose to be without.

J. SARGEANT.

#### ELLIS' AETNA.

*Aetna*. By ROBINSON ELLIS, LL.D., Corpus Professor of the Latin Language and Literature. Oxford 1901.

THIS very complete and exhaustive edition includes a critical recension of the text based on a new examination of MSS., a prose translation facing the text, and an exegetical

commentary as well as elaborate prolegomena dealing with the history of the poem and the MSS. in which it is preserved. It is a model of criticism at once brilliant and cautious, giving full weight, and yet no more than is due, to diplomatic tradition on the one hand and to the imperative claims of language and metre on the other. It



has been the fortune of this poem to have amongst its editors intemperate champions of both of these schools. It has had, on the one hand, editors like Baehrens who are ready to employ conjecture not only in correction of MSS. tradition when in conflict with the acknowledged laws of language syntax or metre, but in removal of such idiosyncrasies as may well be characteristic of individual writers, and in the assimilation of the natural diversities of style to a uniform standard. It has had, on the other, its Sudhaus who in blind adherence to MSS. translates right through Latin which in the sixteenth century would have been universally pronounced to be impossible and therefore corrupt.

The admirable edition of Munro (1867) which made such an epoch in the criticism of the poem, strange to say, approximates in some passages to the exponents of the latter view. For instance in 504ff. he keeps to a without changing a letter: the result is:

eminet examen: plagis ardentia saxa,  
scintillas procul esse fides, procul esseruentis,  
which he persuades himself is Latin and means 'the fact that burning stones, that sparks are far away, far away, as they fall to the ground,<sup>1</sup> is a proof that this is caused by blows.' In the present edition the passage runs:

Emicat examen plagis, ardentia saxa  
Scintillant: procul este pedes, procul este ruentes,

which is translated 'at each blow a swarm of sparkles shoot out, the burning rocks flash fire: away, swift feet, away with all your speed.' Here we have at least Latin and English, though *ruentes* is hardly the word one would have expected for 'with all your speed.' Indeed, *ruentes* seems to be better taken with the succeeding words *incolumi feruore cadunt*.<sup>2</sup> His reading and explanation of v. 507

vix unciis quisquam fixo dimoverit illas

is greatly to be preferred to the *iunctis* and *fazo* of Munro, whose conjectural skill throughout has hardly maintained the brilliant promise of *Hyla* and *Ladonis* in the opening lines of the poem.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ruentis* we take to be a misprint for *ruentes*.

<sup>2</sup> D'Orville's *procul este, sudas, procul este, tridentis* is too violent a desertion of the MSS., but it is very attractive—just the forcible-feeble way in which the minor poet would have described the uselessness of stakes and levers in getting rid of the lava; and it falls in with Prof. Ellis's conjecture *unciis*.

<sup>3</sup> In many other places, conspicuously in 493, 502, 535, Munro elicits from his reading a meaning which can hardly be found in it.

NO. CXXXIX. VOL. XVI.

Among the places (which are numerous) in which Prof. Ellis has either convinced us that he has restored the true text or at least has made a more plausible suggestion than other editors we would give a high place to his *ducit namque omnis hiatus* 96, *novent* (for *movent*) *hoc plura necesse est* 148, *gyros* 324, *rigent* 384, *crispantur* 393, *bruta* 409, *carbo* 411, and especially his brilliant and certain vindication of the hitherto misunderstood reading of the MSS. in 212 *spiritus inflatis nomen, languentibus aer*, where he shows that 'two conditions of imprisoned air, in tension or in subsidence, are contrasted,' the former being called *spiritus* (something like our 'gas,' except that it does not connote anything inflammable). His distinction he proves by passages from Seneca, to whose correspondent Lucilius Junior the poem seems to be rightly attributed. It would be interesting here to give a few of the arguments by which the Editor has supported his conjectures, but this would demand far too much space, and we must content ourselves with referring our readers to the book itself. Less probable but very interesting are the following: *quidquid et inferni, falsi consortia adhaerent* 84, *ingens for ignes* 188, *itis for istis (ipsis)* 271 (where, however, we prefer Baehrens' *sic avidis semper quævis res carior ipsis*), *nivis in sese* 283, *bruta for tutū* 409, *haud equidem mirum scaterest* 456, *simans* 494, *rhydas* 531, *artem* 553.

The number of passages obelised is considerable. For instance, in 23 he prints *quidquid in antiquum iactata est fabula carmen*. Would it be rash to suggest (in a desperate passage) that we have here a ἀραξ εἰρημίων *fabile*, which would certainly have been corrupted into *fabula*? As the best MSS. add *et* after *quidquid*, we might perhaps read *quodque et in antiquum iactatū est fabile carmen*, which would mean 'ay, everything that can be uttered has been hitched into some lay of old.' Verses 79, 80 are thus printed:

[Mentiti uates stygias undasque canentes]  
Hi Tityon tpoena stravere in iugera foedum.

Now it seems to us that he might have avoided both the *athetesis* and the *obelus*, without calling on conjecture more than he is constantly obliged to do in this difficult and very corrupt poem. He might have given his own excellent *ualles* for *uates* and Scaliger's *canesque* for *canentis* (*canes = Furias*), correcting with Unger *foedum* to *fetum*: the phrase *poena...fetum* is strongly supported by Aen. vi. 598 and other

passages quoted by the Editor. *In iugera* in the sense of 'over whole acres' seems quite possible in such a poem. At all events *ualles* (as well as *adierunt* for *viderunt* in 77) is deserving of a place in the footnotes. The Editor, who is unusually free from bias in favour of his own conjectures, has relegated both suggestions to the Commentary.

In 52 in reading *per inertia* for the *que* *tertia* of the MSS. he has given the most poetical suggestion that has been made; but there is much to be said for Suringar's hypothesis of a gloss. The passage (51-53) might have run originally

*Impius et miles metuientia cominus astra  
Provocat admotisq; deos ad proelia signis.*

In 69, *tum Liber cessata* (*cessat* or *celsa* MSS.) *venit per sidera*, no satisfactory parallel for *cessata* = *quiescentia* is given in the notes: it is not the same as *cessata...spectacula* in 389. In the puzzling passage 292, which so well illustrates the difficulties besetting the poem, and which he gives as *nam veluti sonat urna ciens Tritona canorum*, we prefer Munro's *sonat hora duci Tritone canoro*. It has strong MS. authority, *ora duc* of C, and the musical Triton might have sounded the hour for a *naumachia* such as that in Suetonius, *duci* being the Emperor. *Sonat urna* might, of course, easily have been corrupted into the *sonatura* of the Vatican codex, but could a hydraulic machine be called *urna*, and would not *ciere* be a somewhat strange word for setting the Triton going?

It will be seen from these necessarily few and brief quotations, that, if there is nothing in the present work quite so certain or so brilliant as the Editor's *ne frit quidem* for *nec erit quidem* in Plaut. *Most.* iii. 1. 61, yet there is still much to charm those who are still capable of being delighted by an ingenious and scholarly emendation and who find a high pleasure in following the arguments by which it is supported. In this respect the Commentary is extremely full and complete, and as much so in the defence of the conjectures of others (e.g. the *trecenti* of Buecheler and Sudhaus in 579) as of the Editor's own.

The date and authorship of the *Aetna* are fully discussed in the Prolegomena. He rejects the claims of Cornelius Severus, Manilius, and Virgil. The date, he holds, must be subsequent to Virgil and probably

before the Silver Age, possibly in the reign of Augustus, but most probably in the later Claudian or early Neronian era. He thinks it may be plausibly assigned to Lucilius Junior, the correspondent of the younger Seneca, with whose works, and in particular the seven books of *Natural Questions*, the poem shows a close and very intimate agreement.

As to the MSS. of the *Aetna*, the great question is, what is the relative value of CS on the one hand and of the Gyraldinian variants on the other. C is the Cambridge tenth century codex first completely collated by Munro. S is the *Fragmentum Stabulense*, an eleventh century codex containing most of the *Aetna*, once in the Monastery of Stavelot, now in the National Library of Paris. The Gyraldinian readings refer only to vv. 138-285; they belong to a very early codex now lost, but used in the sixteenth century by Silius Gyraldus. Baehrens makes of these readings a first-class as compared with other MSS., C and S included. Prof. Ellis in a very well sustained argument shows the absolute superiority of C, and of S (which agrees very closely with C), not only to all the fifteenth century MSS., but to the Gyraldinian variants. Of the variants plainly not due to conjecture the editor gives many examples, the most interesting of which are the following: (α) 226 *ingenium sacrare caputque attollere caelo* against *sacra per ingentem capitique attollere caelum* of C; compare the curiously parallel phrase of Seneca (*Nat. Quest.* Pref. to Bk. iv. § 10) *ingenium consecrare*: (β) 213 *nam prope nequicquam pars est violentia* against *par est* of C, for *parsest* is a corruption of *persest* (*per se est*) the admirable conjecture of Wagler: (γ) 165 *aquasque* against *-a quaeque* of C, for the variant leads to the now generally accepted emendation of Munro, *ocuatque*. But in addition to these Prof. Ellis gives other classes of variants, some plainly wrong, some hardly intelligible, many imperfectly or wrongly reported, and very many such as could have been made (some, as we have seen, have actually been made) by well-trained scholars. He has certainly established his thesis that when the Gyraldinian variants are in marked antagonism to CS we are bound to give our first consideration to CS, our second to them.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

## GLOVER'S FOURTH CENTURY.

*Life and Letters in the Fourth Century.* By T. R. GLOVER, Cambridge University Press. Pp. 398. Price 10s.

THE appearance within a few years of two such books as Mr. Glover's *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century* and Mr. Dill's *Roman Society in the last Century of the Western Empire* may be held to mark a widening of English interest in ancient history and a wish to follow it to its end and link it with what came after, such as that which has existed in France for some time and found expression in de Coulange's work and in Mr. Boissier's *La Fin du Paganisme*. Mr. Glover's plan for studying his period is, like some of Boissier's chapters, chiefly biographical, and has the advantages and the drawbacks of that method. The interest which biography and talk about persons so readily excite is forwarded, in Mr. Glover's case, by a pleasant style and by considerable skill in the arrangement of materials. It is always agreeable too to listen when a student has submitted the authors to a fresh reading and gives us the result of an independent estimate; and there is something for everyone's taste in a list of subjects which takes in Ammianus Marcellinus, Julian, Quintus of Smyrna, Ausonius, Women Pilgrims, Symmachus, Macrobius, St. Augustine, Claudian, Prudentius, Sulpicius Severus, Palladas, Synesius, and Greek and Early Christian Novels.

It will at once be seen from this enumeration how wide is the ground traversed, and how many topics of both Christian and Pagan interest are involved in these names. But on the other hand the interest is, as it were, cut into sections. One feels at the end of the volume a certain want of unity in what one has read; there is a lack of positive conclusions. We have had a pleasant hour with Achilles Tatius or with Ammianus, but what is left us when the hour is over? What is the general tendency of the period? What is the general view of political or literary history into which these authors fit?

Something is done to meet this feeling by the introductory chapter (pp. 1-19). This is more closely packed with thought—or at all events moves more among generalizations—than the other chapters. Mr. Glover gives us in it a sketch of (1) The Empire, its good side and its weakness; (2) Art, Edu-

cation, and Literature; (3) Philosophy; (4) The Church. But his authorities here are not very different from those dealt with singly in the body of the book. A fuller survey, at either the beginning or the end of the work, would have laid a firmer foundation for the single studies. It would also have entailed a much wider use of evidences other than literary. Monumental evidence, which exists of course in many different kinds, would usefully supplement the literary sources (as we can judge from Mr. Glover's own use of the sepulchral monument of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus). It suggests many new problems; it discloses undercurrents; it reveals the life of little people. The letters of Symmachus show us abundantly the gentleman and the well-to-do man of the period; but we cannot gather from them the hopes and fears and troubles of the poor man in town and country. Moreover, while monumental evidence may, like any other, be misinterpreted, it can hardly be edited or dressed-up, and seldom positively falsified or forged; whereas 'The correspondence of Symmachus was edited by his son' who 'carefully removed anything unsafe, anything beneath the dignity of a great man, anything relating to common life or business or passing events': and Mr. Glover does not find Claudian's account of the transaction at Pollentia very satisfactory.

Chiefly of course we want to know all that can be discovered or inferred about the economic condition of the sinking empire. There is perhaps no time when the influence of economic factors is more clearly and more immediately manifest than in the case of a state which has had the command of abundant funds and now has a difficulty in making both ends meet. The connection between antecedents and consequents is there not only plain, it is worked out quickly. That there was enormous distress of this kind is well known, and Mr. Glover just brings the fact within the frame of his picture by mentioning 'the Decurions, the long-suffering upper class' [p. 108. On p. 4, 'the middle classes paid all the taxes.'] But that is hardly enough, if we are to see the Life of the Fourth Century as well as its Letters. We want to have the causes set forth which crippled the means of the State, the effects which followed in the national or collective life, and the ways in which

they told upon all ranks, on separate classes and individuals. How were various trades affected? How were agriculture and commerce modified? How soon did the civilized institutions, the costly organization, the liberal foundations, begin to feel the pinch? It is likely that, even though the books fail us here, yet archaeology can be made to tell a great deal more on these points than it has yet told.

There are some other large aspects of life about which *Life and Letters* has little to say. There is the law. There is the spoken language, the decaying Latin. This too is only just hinted at in mentioning, as one feature of the writings of St. Silvia of Aquitaine, 'peculiar spellings, which show a Latin wearing down towards French.' But such changes or corruptions, popular pronunciation and popular idiom, could be largely illustrated from early Christian inscriptions.

We have always found a great difficulty in understanding the feeling of the 'Romans' about their troubles during the many centuries in which the empire was, as we say, decaying. If some, as certain Christians, see the hand of God striking terrible blows, other writers, both Christian and pagan, seem quite unconscious of their real position. Their apparent indifference or apathy or ignorance puzzles us, but Mr. Glover does not feel this so much. Indeed, he seems to think there was more trouble and alarm in men's minds than we find there. He speaks in particular of 'the distress caused by the Gothic invasions, partly to be traced to the feeling that, if Rome fell, there was no possible power to take her place' (p. 3); and this is borne out by a quotation from Synesius on p. 326. But on the other hand he himself says that 'One might read the letters of Symmachus without forming any clear idea of the dangers, internal and external, of the Empire, just as it is almost impossible to gather from Miss Austen's pages that England was at war with Napoleon.' 'To the barbarians Symmachus makes no allusion in his letters.' Synesius 'gives no hint of having heard of the capture of Rome by the Goths.'

There is at least one very luminous suggestion thrown out in Mr. Glover's introduction. (He does not claim the thought as his own, referring readers to Seeck, *Gesch. des Untergangs der antiken Welt*. The suggestion, however, if not the application, is to be found, if we mistake not, in Mr. F. Galton's *Studies in Human Faculty*). Mr. Glover says:

'Faction, with its retaliatory massacres, had in Greece steadily eliminated eminence and capacity. In Rome much the same thing had befallen in the last century of the Republic and in the years of usurping and suspicious Emperors. The level therefore of Greek and Roman genius steadily fell.'

The proscriptions had done far-reaching harm by 'removing the brave and independent, and leaving only the weaker to be the fathers of a new generation.' Again, 'the tendency to asceticism and celibacy which went with the general revival of religion did not help the world, the finer natures leaving no children. The same unhappy result followed the persecutions of the Christians.' All this is important; and the agencies mentioned cannot possibly have failed to take effect, in the long run and on a large average. Yet in the very generations which are in question races new, healthy, and undecimated, were being taken up into the Empire and sending their representatives up to the very top of the State.

The great subject of religion suffers more than most from not being dealt with in any one central place of the book, and not having its parts grouped into one picture. The chief divisions of the matter, with which the author deals, are (i) Christianity, in more places than one; (ii) Manichaeism; (iii) Neoplatonism, in more places than one; (iv) Mithras-worship. Survivals of older civilized worships, as the Egyptian, or barbarian cults, as in Gaul and Britain, hardly come within his scope. On the four divisions just enumerated he has much to say that is well worth hearing; but it is not focussed. His judgement is very fair and unprejudiced. The weakness of paganism and the corruption of Christianity are justly set against each other. The chapter on Women Pilgrims finds fresh material in the *Peregrinatio Silviae*. That on St. Augustine, one of peculiar interest, is cut disappointingly short by the wish to deal with him chiefly as a man of letters and not to handle fully his theology, his influence on the church, or his great work as Bishop of Hippo.

The successive essays are not of course all equally full or of equal importance. Some are more penetrating than others, as well as more agreeable, and the paper on Claudian stands very high in both these respects. But much always depends upon the degree of sympathy felt by the writer for his hero,



a bond which cannot be commanded; and Mr. Glover has evidently little sympathy with the Emperor Julian, to whom he gives thirty pages. These thirty pages we have read three times, and always with a strong sense of disappointment. It is not only with the handling of the topic that we are disappointed; it is also discouraging to find how possible it is for two readers who have both honestly spent time over original documents to come to very different conclusions. But then too, Julian has always excited strong feelings, whether of good will or of antipathy. We can recall no second critic who has held the scales in the matter of that ruler with the severe impartiality of Dr. Wordsworth; and we confess that we do not always think Mr. Glover quite fair to Julian. It is not that he designs to give the apostate less than his due; he means to be fair, and he thinks, we are quite sure, that he is fair; but he is unconsciously too angry with the man to do real justice to either the man or the emperor.

Here is a general statement of Mr. Glover's than which nothing could be better:—'In what follows I have generally of set purpose avoided the testimony of the more hostile authorities.' In another place he has a very good word for Julian, speaking of 'his manliness, his purity and piety, the intense earnestness and dutifulness of his nature.' But the whole attitude of the chapter when he gets beyond these generalities, is hostile and even carping. Poor Julian's very appearance is brought up against him; Gregory of Nazianzus is the witness; while the contrary testimony of busts and statues is altogether ignored. Yet the bust in the Capitoline Museum at Rome, if we can rely upon it, would alone give us a favourable impression of the sitter. But the real unfairness of the chapter is let out most clearly in speaking of 'the malignity and hatred with which ecclesiastical writers have, or are supposed to have, pursued his memory.' The words which we have italicised should never have been used unless they were going to be fully justified.

There is little tangible to be said (and proved) against Julian. He was on the wrong tack, that is certain and admitted: he wrote flattering and insincere panegyrics on Constantius, a ruthless despot in whose power he was: he sent a specially severe governor to a city which had personally insulted him. What else there was, which was worth talking about, we hardly know. The legends of Julian's putting Christians

(St. John and St. Paul) to death are, very properly, not mentioned by Mr. Glover: and we see little to set Mr. Glover so strongly against him except want of sympathy, in fact incompatibility of temper. It cannot be denied that he was a ruler of very considerable practical ability. To say he degenerated in the latter part of his life (pp. 56, 59, 75), is rather to beg the question; and further, how long did the poor man have to degenerate in, or to show his degeneracy? Critics of Julian do not always realize how short his time was, how much he did in it of hard and needful work, and how little opportunity there was for certain things which they impute to him or expect of him. Mr. Glover's own useful table of dates reminds us that Julian was proclaimed Emperor in Gaul in 360 [the text says 360 in one place, 361 in another], and died in Asia in June 363. He had to fight for his throne and life at the beginning of this time, and to organize and lead an expedition into Persia in the second half of it. How long then had he to arrange anti-Christian reforms, and to see 'the world over, his reformation producing disorder and ill-will?' The shortness of his days, as well as their fullness, prevented his doing half of what is credited to him, and of course he left his plans little more than plans. But what would have been said of him if he had *not* tried to reform and improve paganism?

Of Julian's religious views one would wish to speak with all caution, and I shall certainly not attack his adversaries' characters or plans with the same acerbity which Mr. Glover shows to Julian. It is better to leave them untouched. But, as to the Emperor himself, is it really true that he believed in his own god-head (pp. 59, 76)? We greatly prefer Mr. Glover's other expression, that Julian thought himself 'the chosen vessel of Heaven.' He was not (he thought) a god, but was 'chosen by the gods to restore the old faith.' He was annoyed 'when men applauded him in a temple; there they must adore the gods, and not the Emperor' (Letter 64). His belief in magic and in the appearances of gods to mortals seems to us weak, but is not so weak as compared with the standard of his age, and such superstitions are not confined to the fourth century or to paganism. As Mr. Glover tells us in another place, 'The prayers of Synesius, both as a neo-Platonist and as a Christian, were mainly for freedom from anxieties, from attacks of demons, and from the influence of matter.'

But in writing thus we have no wish to initiate a controversy and no hope of converting Mr. Glover. People will go on differing about Julian to the end of time; and all that can be done, when one has an adversary at once so well informed, and so opposed, is to set out at least some of the points of difference, and there leave the matter.

There is no other large section of the *Life and Letters* on which we find ourselves so much at variance with the author (though we might, if space were unlimited, have something to say about the judgement of M. Aurelius expressed on p. 307); and it is pleasant to dwell rather on the care and

accuracy and clearness of sight which have gone to the making of so notable a book. The many interwoven translations give us excellently the sense of the originals: sometimes even the style is cleverly conveyed. The long-winded prolixity of Ammianus can perhaps not be reproduced without the appearance of caricature; but the rendering of a very different writer on p. 137 gives no inadequate notion of her style. It is probably the exigencies of rhyme which make Mr. Glover's verse-translation of the first epigram of Palladas on p. 313 go rather wide of the original Greek.

FRANKLIN T. RICHARDS.

#### KALBFLEISCH'S PYPYRI ARGENTORATENSES GRAECAE.

*Papyri Argentoratenses Graecae*, editae a CAROLO KALBFLEISCH. (Rostock. Program. 1901.)

THE Strassburg papyri, which form a small but interesting collection, are being published in what appears to be a haphazard and inconvenient fashion. Some have been edited by Kaibel and Reitzenstein in various articles in *Hermes*; one, a very interesting historical fragment, has been made the text of a considerable volume by Prof. Keil; for the facsimile of the valuable Hesiodic fragment on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, it is necessary to have recourse to the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy; while two medical papyri have been assigned to Prof. Kalbfleisch, and form the subject of a *Program* emanating from the University of Rostock. They are not large fragments, nor are they specially important; but they are worth publishing, and have been carefully edited by Prof. Kalbfleisch. Four good photographic facsimiles form a very praiseworthy feature of the edition, and enable scholars who have no means of seeing the originals to form their own opinions as to date and readings. The first papyrus (Pap. Argent. Gr. 90) deals with diseases of the eye, classifying their causes and giving recipes for their treatment. It

consists of two fragments, each with writing on both sides; and Prof. Kalbfleisch, supported by Wilcken, thinks that all the writing is by one hand, though written at different times. This is possible, and the identity of subject is in favour of this view; but it is difficult to feel certain, in view of the marked differences in the hands. The papyrus may be assigned with confidence to the second century. It is much mutilated, and its restoration would require a knowledge of Greek medicine to which I cannot pretend. The other document (Pap. Argent. Gr. 1), which contains three fairly complete columns and two which are very defective, treats of intermittent fevers. It is written in a clear, neat, semi-uncial hand (much reduced in the photograph) of the second century, and its doctrines, in the editor's opinion, point to a date between Celsus and Galen. Prof. Kalbfleisch suggests Agathinus of Lacedaemon, a physician of the 'pneumatic' school, who lived in the second century, as a possible author. The *verso* of the papyrus is occupied by accounts, assigned by Wilcken to the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth. It hardly seems necessary to place them lower than the third century.

F. G. KENYON.

## DAVIS' A FRIEND OF CAESAR.

*A Friend of Caesar: a Tale of the Fall of the Roman Republic.* By WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS. New York: the Macmillan Company, 1900.

'He was delighted to find scribbled on the wall, "Artemisia to her Agias: you are real mean."' (p. 142) 'If this book,' says the preface, 'serves to show that Classical Life presented many phases akin to our own, it will not have been written in vain.' It is apparently not written for the scholar, whose temper will be tried by fussy footnotes, which inform him that Baiae was a famous watering-place, or that *pulcherrima* means 'most beautiful.' The lay reader, for whom it is intended, will have three facts impressed on his memory, that the Romans spoke the language of the modern melodrama, garnished with occasional *poles* and *hems* to preserve the local colour, that Julius Caesar when not ranting was engaged in twaddling, and that the best Greek wine in Rome was to be obtained at 'the Big Eagle restaurant down on the Vicus Jugarius.' The language and sentiments of the characters, partly historical and partly imaginary, are about as much like those of Cicero's contemporaries, as the language and sentiments of Rasselas are like those of Abyssinians of the eighteenth century. Here is a specimen of Caesar's after-dinner conversation:

"Therefore while we love we do indeed dwell in the Islands of the Blessed: but when the vision

fades away, its sweet memory remains to cheer us in our life below, and teach us that where the cold intellect may not go, there is indeed some way, on through the mists of the future, which leads we know not whither; but which leads to things purer and fairer than those which in our most ambitious moments we crave." The voice of the conqueror of Gaul and German sank with a half tremor; his eye was moist, his lips continued moving after his words had ceased to flow.' (p. 214)

But best of all is the thrilling scene at the Rubicon—transpontine indeed, but fortunately too long to quote. Indeed Mr. Davis has a fine turn of eloquence. The following soars far beyond us:

'The azure above glowed with living brightness, and by night the stars and planets burned and twinkled down from a crystalline void, through which the unfettered soul might soar and soar, swimming onward through the sweet darkness of the infinite' (p. 242).

To give Mr. Davis his due, the archaeology is fairly correct, though we may doubt whether the Latin for storehouses is *horreae*, or whether Gallic horses were called *mammi*, or whether Chrysippus was born 180 B.C. What are we to make of this sentence: '*Vina Opimia* is the best'? What was the *ius osculii*? Where is the town of Coma? Who is Calverly? and who Ichomachus? What authority is there for the black shoes of the Equites? or for the quotation 'that majesty that doth hedge about a king'? or for the grammar of 'whom she was sure was in the house'?

J. H. VINCE.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE EARLY AGE OF GREECE.

PROF. P. GARDNER in the English Historical Review (1901, pp. 743-6) framed some strictures upon my 'Early Age of Greece' which I have hitherto had no opportunity of answering. I should have dealt with them in a postscript to my reply to Mr. Myres in the last number of the *Classical Review* had space allowed.

Dr. Gardner says that I call 'the Achæan theory (of the origin of 'Mycenean' culture) as much out of date as the geocentric scheme

of astronomy.' In dealing with Dr. Gardner's belief in the Achæan theory I said: 'Dr. Gardner comforts himself with the reflection that most archaeologists have held the Achæan theory, but he forgets that there was a time when the majority of astronomers believed that the sun revolved round the earth.' This does not assert that the Achæan theory is out of date, but it shows that the fact that the theory is held by Perrot and the majority of archaeologists

(the only grounds put forward for his belief by Dr. Gardner) is no evidence of its truth.

Against Dr. Gardner and the majority of archaeologists I maintained that the Mycenaean culture was not that of the Homeric Achaeans, but of a section of the indigenous Mediterranean race, and I further hold that the Achaeans of Homer had come down from central Europe in the early Iron Age. Dr. Gardner has now come over to me, for he now says that the recent discoveries in Crete 'prove that in Crete at least the race of the Mycenaean civilization was not Hellenic,' but, when he states that the 'character of the palace at Cnossus' &c. 'all seem to point to a culture in relations with those of Egypt and Babylon, a cousin perhaps of the Caneanite civilization, but having no relation whatever to anything Greek,' he does not face my arguments to show that the full growth of the Mycenaean art in Crete is to be ascribed to influences from continental Greece (p. 202) confirmed by Mr. Evans' discoveries there cited. Further, if there was a non-Aryan people in Crete, they would have been the Eteocretans, but Bosanquet's excavations at Praesus, a chief city of that race, have shown that it certainly was not a cradle of the full Mycenaean culture.

He says that I 'hopelessly confuse the question of race and the question of the character of civilization.' Yet my words (p. 74) 'that the same primitive culture was spread over the whole of the Mediterranean and even central Europe' show that I do no such thing.

He says that my proposition that 'the race that produced the Mycenaean culture was a Greek-speaking race called by the historians Pelasgi' is 'baseless and extravagant,' and he says that my 'way of citing and trusting ancient writers is one which is generally supposed to have been extinct among scholars since the days of Niebuhr.' It is enough to refer him to my replies (C.R. pp. 82 col. 2 and p. 83 col. 2) to similar charges by Mr. Myres (C.R. p. 71 col. 2 and p. 75 col. 2). Dr. Gardner blames me for using Homer and Aeschylus, yet he himself (*Man. Gr. Antig.* p. 152) cites Callimachus to prove that 'the Pelasgians planted in Dotian territory near Lake Boebeis in Thessaly a grove in honour of Demeter.'

Dr. Gardner 'welcomes' my chapter on the

Homeric age, but he does not tell the reader that it proves that the Mycenaean culture was that of the Pre-Achaean Pelasgi, while that of the Homeric Achaeans is that of the full Iron Age which I identify with the culture of the early Iron Age of central Europe. He would thus appear to have given up his old belief that the Achaeans had created the Mycenaean culture! I hold that the Achaeans were a large fair-haired people who came from central Europe. Dr. Gardner now admits 'that the Achaeans were a fair-haired race, and that they came down into Greece from the north.' 'But' (says he) 'why should the Achaeans be Celts rather than Germans, if they are not to be (what seems after all most natural) Hellenic?' But he might have seen on my page 369 that I, like the ancients, include Germans in the term Celts. Over two dozen reviewers have noticed this and I have dealt with the point in my reply to Mr. Myres *supr.* p. 88 col. 1. Dr. Gardner in suggesting that the Achaeans are Hellenic is only again adopting my doctrine (*Early Age*, 112-3). Thus Dr. Gardner is another of my converts. Yet in the face of these admissions he calls my theory 'baseless and extravagant.'

He says that 'the best authorities' will not accept my dates for Hallstatt. 'The best authorities' are dealt with in my reply to Mr. Myres (C.R. 89). Dr. Gardner objects to my arguments from philology (1) pointing out that I do not suggest a Celtic derivation for Achilles, and (2) saying in reference to certain labialized forms in Greek (e.g. ἴππος, πέτταρες) that he 'has asked the highest authorities to whom he has access and their reply is adverse to giving any weight to Mr. Ridgeway's view.' Unluckily for my critic Mr. J. H. Moulton (*Lond. Qu. Rev.* 1902) has pointed out in support of my view that Fick (*Personennamen*) has already identified Ἀχιλλεύς with *Agilulfs*. Dr. Gardner's reliance on authority has proved unfortunate for him in the case of the Achaeans, and the date of Hallstatt; equally so is his trust in his philologist friends, for they evidently did not know Fick's derivation of Achilles. Can Dr. Gardner's 'best authorities' show that ἴππος is a true Greek Form, or can they meet my arguments based on the Arcadian dialect?

WILLIAM RIDGEWAY.



## ARCHAEOLOGY.

## AN ALLUSION TO THE MYCENAEAN SCRIPT IN PLUTARCH.

SINCE the discovery of a Mycenaean system of writing in Crete, the most brilliant among the many archaeological triumphs of Mr. A. Evans, it may be allowed to scholars to surmise that here and there, in the by-paths of classical literature, may be preserved some faint or legendary allusions to the existence of such a prehistoric script. The Keeper of the Ashmolean has himself in one of his public lectures called attention to one passage in an ancient author that proves the occasional find of 'Mycenaean tablets' in the classical period (Dictys Cret. Prolog.). I venture to cite another, of which the evidence seems to me unmistakable, but which has not yet been noticed, so far as I am aware, in this connection. Having been recently engaged upon the investigation of herocults in Greece, I came upon the following narrative in Plutarch's dialogue 'de Genio Socratis' (c. 5, p. 575 E)—the grave of Alcmena near Haliartos was opened in the fourth century B.C. by the Spartan king Agesilaos, in order that the Lacedaemonians might secure the sacred relics of the ancestress of the Heracleidae: 'no vestige of the body was found in the tomb, but a bronze armet of moderate size and two amphorae full of earth that had been petrified by course of time (. . . the text is here impaired, but the enumeration of the articles in the tomb is continued), a bronze tablet containing many letters of wonderful antiquity: for the writing conveyed no information at all, although the letters were quite clear when the tablet had been washed; but the type of the characters was of a peculiar and foreign kind, very like the Egyptian. (πῖναξ χάλκεος ἔχων γράμματα πολλὰ θαυμαστὰ ὡς παντάλεια· γινῶναι γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδὲν παρέχε, καίπερ ἐκφανέντα τοῦ χαλκοῦ καταπληθέντος, ἀλλ' ἰδίως τις ὁ τύπος καὶ βαρβαρικός τῶν χαρακτήρων ἐμφερέστατος Αἰγυπτίοις). Wherefore Agesilaos, as they said, sent a copy of it to the Great King, requesting him to show it to his priests, in case they might be able to interpret it.' The story bears upon it the stamp of genuineness, and Plutarch was both an honest man and an enthusiastic antiquarian. The Alcmenemyth belongs to a Mycenaean stratum, and the tradition of her cult contains a legend of

stone-worship. The Spartans in the fourth century would as naturally desire to acquire her relics from Boeotia as formerly they had desired to carry off the bones of Orestes from Arcadia. The tomb of Alcmena would be a Mycenaean tomb, found in a neighbourhood that was a great centre of Mycenaean culture and that was associated by legend with Crete. The writing on the bronze tablet was evidently neither 'classical' Greek nor Phoenician, nor Egyptian, though 'very like Egyptian.' This is exactly how we should expect a Greek of the fourth century B.C., or of Plutarch's period, to describe the newly revealed 'Eteokretan' or even the specially Knossian script. The story preserved by Plutarch, which could not possibly be a freak of either popular or learned mendacity, bears important corroboration to the theory well maintained by Mr. Evans, that a similar system of writing prevailed over a very wide Mycenaean area: and it also shows that the classical use of bronze tablets as material for writing descends from the Mycenaean period.

LEWIS R. FARNELL.

## BIENKOWSKI'S ICONOGRAPHY OF BARBARIANS.

*De Simulacris barbararum gentium apud Romanos.* Ed. PETRUS BIENKOWSKI. Cracow and Vienna. 1900. 10 M.

THIS is a work published, under the auspices of the Academy of Cracow, in Polish and German. The author explains that it is part of a much larger work, a *Corpus* of representations of Barbarians in ancient art. He has chosen an excellent task, which combines historic, artistic and ethnographic interest; and the first instalment is of a character to show that he has all the ability necessary to its complete accomplishment. He is somewhat handicapped by having to print in two languages. What a pity it is that Latin has ceased to be the usual vehicle for learned dissertations!

As a sort of *prodromus* or introduction to his *Corpus*, Dr. Bienkowski gives us in the present publication an account of the allegorical impersonations of races and provinces which are to be found on Roman monuments. These allegorical figures are almost always female. As, however, in all ancient

art, excluding only Roman portraits, women are rendered in a more generalised and ideal fashion than men, it is often almost or wholly impossible to discriminate between figures of barbarian captive women, and impersonations of barbarous races. For example, we cannot determine whether the so-called Thusnelda of Florence, one of the most fascinating works of ancient art, really represents a German queen or Germania.

Dr. Bienkowski's essay falls naturally into two parts. The first includes the personifications of barbarous races; the second the figures which stand for provinces of the Roman Empire.

It is a curious fact that the German types come out better in Graeco-Roman art than those of most other peoples. Some of the Roman statues of them have a curiously modern air: an example is the beautiful head at St. Petersburg, which might almost pass for a northern Madonna. But yet there were points of contact between the Germans and Greek art. The Germans had a custom of covering their breasts but little: the men as Tacitus tells us went into battle *more patrio nudis corporibus*: and even the women in spite of the German climate seem not to have worn an under garment with long sleeves, like the women of Gaul and Asia Minor. Tacitus says *nudae brachia et lacertos; sed et proxima pars pectoris patet*. This quite suited the customs of Greek art; and the figure of Thusnelda, already mentioned, is almost purely classical in pose and dress. An apparent exception is the figure supposed to be Germania on the so-called Trophies of Marius on the Capitol (Bienkowski, p. 39) which wears long sleeves and is swathed in ample garments: but it is very doubtful whether this woman represents any German race. Her dress, and the arms with which she is associated, including scale-armour and bows, seem to point rather to Sarmatia and the neighbourhood of the Black Sea.

One of the most interesting series of statues in Rome is the set of representations of Provinces of the Empire which were originally set up, probably in the time of Hadrian, in connection with the so-called Basilica of Neptune, and some of which are now in the Museum of the Capitol. These were fully discussed by Dr. Lucas in a paper in the *Jahrbuch* of the Institute for 1900: but Dr. Lucas was not altogether successful in understanding or attributing the statues, probably because he missed the true key to them, which is furnished by that remarkable series of coins issued in

the reign of Hadrian, and commemorating his journeys into the various provinces of the Roman Empire. On these coins we have not only figures of the provinces visited, but the name of the province in each case. They thus enable us to attribute the uninscribed statues of the Basilica of Neptune. At p. 52 Dr. Bienkowski fully recognises the importance of this numismatic clue; but for some unexplained reason, he does not engrave as a series these interesting coins, a fact the more to be regretted as they are not, so far as I am aware, anywhere satisfactorily figured. The statues of the Basilica also deserve to be better known; they embody, as no other sculptural works do, the extent, the variety, and the orderliness of the Roman Empire, when it had reached its widest extent. And although they are not great original works, they are singularly pleasing and graceful. Modern sculptors have so often set before them the task of creating allegorical types of countries and cities, that it might naturally interest them to see how such problems were solved in the art-loving age of Hadrian.

P. GARDNER.

#### ADLER'S MAUSOLEUM AT HALICARNASOS.

*Das Mausoleum zu Halikarnass.* By F. ADLER. Berlin. 12 M.

THE restoration of the Mausoleum is certainly among the most interesting problems offered us by ancient architecture. Many points in respect to it are unsettled, and in regard to some of these it may be doubted if they will ever be settled. It is a great gain to have a treatise on the subject from so able and experienced an architect as Dr. Adler, who has been interested in the Mausoleum, as he tells us, from the day of its discovery by Newton. Dr. Adler's reconstruction can scarcely be regarded as final: but it is careful and workmanlike, and shows mastery of the materials.

On the whole Dr. Adler's conclusions are conservative. He rejects the opinion of Trendelenburg, who maintained that we have no authority for raising the building on a lofty podium, and the decidedly novel and striking views of Mr. Oldfield. Though he condemns Pullan's elevation as clumsy and unsightly, his own is not unlike it, except that he reduces the heaviness and the height of the podium. The latter he

effects, without diminishing the total height of the building, by inserting on the top of the pyramid a huge base to support the chariot of Pythis, and a platform above the columns of the pteron, on which he places in a row the numerous lions found among the remains. In a plan now in my possession Newton had placed these lions on the steps of the pyramid; Dr. Adler's disposition of them seems certainly happier, if it is consistent with existing remains.

Perhaps the most crucial point in any reconstruction of the Mausoleum is to be found in the way in which the restorer deals with Pliny's statement as to the area of the tomb. The main part of the building, he says, was a pteron or temple surrounded by columns; and he goes on to say that of this pteron the sides were 63 feet in length, and the front and back less, while the circumference was 411 (or 440, cxi or cxi) feet. But it is obvious that if the longer sides were only 63 feet, the circumference of the whole could not reach 252 feet. Mr. Oldfield met this difficulty by giving the pteron a cruciform plan, which enabled him to keep Pliny's figures intact. Dr. Adler objects that for such a plan there is no precedent among Greek buildings. But it may be rejoined that the plans of the Erechtheum and the Propylaea at Athens are roughly cruciform and easily lend themselves to further development. Dr. Adler himself adopts the simple expedient of altering Pliny's 63 to 89, and taking 440 feet as the circumference not of the pteron, but of the basis on which it rests. However, as the text of Pliny is in question, philologists also will have a right to an opinion, and they will probably think that to accept all Pliny's measurements as correct, save one, and in case of that one to introduce an almost impossible correction of lxxxix for lxiii is an extreme measure.

P. GARDNER.

## MONTHLY RECORD.

### GERMANY.

*Rhenish Provinces.*—Much progress has been made during 1901 in the exploration of various Roman military posts along the Rhine. At Urmitz a new *castrum* has been laid bare, of later date than the surrounding earthworks, but older than the fort built by Drusus; it probably dates from the time of Julius Caesar or Agrippa. The excavation of the camp of the legions at Neuss (Düsseldorf) has also been completed, and a large officers' house with colonnaded courtyard and store-rooms explored, in which were found many interesting objects. At Haltern in Westphalia the excavation of the Roman

fort named Aliso (*Tac. Ann. ii. 7*), has been continued with successful results. An older fort was found, considerably larger than the other, but obviously of a temporary character; this was probably the actual one built by Drusus in B.C. 11, the other being formed within it shortly afterwards. The later camp was extraordinarily rich in small objects, fragments of pottery, glass vessels, coins, silver clasps, tools, and weapons; a shaft 26 feet deep, made in an unsuccessful attempt to find water, was also brought to light. Excavations have further been made at Andernach, Remagen, and Blankenheim in the Eifel, with finds of bronzes, coins, and inscriptions.<sup>1</sup>

### ITALY.

*Casaleone, Venetia.*—A recent find of coins has been made, numbering some 1040, all more or less in bad condition; they are all denarii and quinarii of Republican date, ranging (as far as examined) from the second century to the end of the first. There seem to be no rare types. Another treasure was found on the same spot in 1889.<sup>2</sup>

*Torre de' Passeri (Samnite territory).* A relief of Luna marble has been found, apparently part of a large base or altar. It represents Athena Hygieia before an altar, with the serpent twisted round her spear, followed by Demeter with ears of corn. Probably the whole monument represented a series of divinities like the Borghese altar and other well-known examples; it is a Roman copy of a Greek fifth-century original.<sup>3</sup>

*Pompeii.* During June 1901 a well-preserved bronze statuette, about 2 ft. 4 in. high, was brought to light, representing a robust nude youth in chlamys and winged sandals, probably Perseus; it is a good specimen of Roman work.<sup>2</sup>

### SICILY.

*Gela.* Dr. Orsi has begun a second campaign, and excavated a large number of tombs, but only two sites were at all fruitful; the results will shortly be published in detail in the *Monumenti Antichi*. Numerous good Attic vases were found, including a fine b.f. example of Herakles contending with Triton; a base of a cup signed by Chachrylion; a krater used to contain ashes, with Theseus and the Minotaur; a beautiful r.f. vase with Mnemosyne (the name inscribed); and many amphorae and lekythi. Two white lekythi give new *καλός*-names: on one is ΕΛΑΙΟΝ ΚΑΛΟΣ [Surely this is ΕΥΑΙΟΝ ΚΑΛΟΣ (Euaion), as on the B.M. vase E 379?—H.B.W.]; on the other ΔΙΟΔΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ and ΛΥΧΟΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ. The last name Orsi regards as equivalent to ΛΙ+ΑΣ, (occurring on the white lekythos in the B.M.D50).<sup>2</sup>

### GREECE.

*Antikythera.*—The divers continue to make discoveries. A third colossion figure of a horse, well preserved, with Gorgoneion on the breast and beautifully-executed harness, has been found, in addition to many torsos and bases of statues or groups; also a fragment of a nude Apollo by a tripod. Numerous vases have turned up, some with inscriptions indicating their contents, such as  $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{H} & \text{IA} \\ \text{X} & \text{K} \end{smallmatrix}$ , which may be interpreted as *ἡμαμόριον ἰδ' ἑξας* (or *χελύκας*) κ',

<sup>1</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 4 Jan. 1902.

<sup>2</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, June 1901.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, May 1901.

i.e. half-amphora No. 11, containing 20 measures. Some well-preserved glass, including a vessel of steel-blue colour with reliefs, and fragments of the ship itself, complete the list.<sup>4</sup>

*Aegina*.—Excavations were resumed in October, and the work on the temple has been completed. The clearing of the east front shows clearly the three different periods of the remains older than the existing temple. On this side the bare rock has been reached, and the finds include numerous bronzes and terracotta idols, and a *tridactyl* shell with Phoenician engraving. The chief task at present is to find the traces of the older foundations, to which end a mine has been dug at the north-west corner of the peristyle, but no traces of the older building appeared, only a Cyclopean circuit-wall. The older blocks seem to have been used up as foundations for the existing temple. Several pieces of the horizontal pediment-cornices have been identified, with holes and sinkings for the figures; these will help the future reconstruction of the pediments. Eighteen types of roof-tiles from the older temple have been found.

Dr. Thiersch has traced ancient remains in other parts of the island, and the remaining half of the *Damia* and *Auxesia* inscription (see *C.R.* 1901, p. 477) has turned up, the inscription being now complete, and cleaned from all incrustations. It is a stele of Pentelic marble, and dates from the Athenian occupation of the island, the letters being small and carelessly cut, not *στρογγύον*. The alphabet is Ionic, of the second half of the fifth century, but Ε and Ο are still used for η and ω, Η being employed for the aspirate. Ξ is used for ξ, Λ for λ, and Σ for s. The text of the 45 lines is published by Furtwaengler. Its chief import is that Herodotus' pair of goddesses were known as *Mnia* and *Auzesia* in *Aegina*, as also at *Epidaurus*. Each had a separate cult-chamber, *Mnia* having a cultus-image of cypress-wood, and an *episthodomos* with an image of *Dionysos*.<sup>5</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

*Revue Numismatique*. Part 4, 1901.

E. J. Seltman. 'Artemis sur une monnaie archaïque de Syracuse.'—D. E. Tacchella. 'Numismatique d'Odessus.'—A. Dieudonné. 'Monnaies grecques récemment acquises par le Cabinet des Médailles.' The acquisitions include:—*Ephesus*. An unpublished octobol, with the head of *Arsinoë II*, wife of *Lysimachus*, struck for *Ephesus* when temporarily named *Arsinoë* B.C. 288–280. *Ephesus*. Bronze of *Antoninus Pius*. rev. standing figure of the philosopher *Heraclitus* holding an object which *Dieudonné* considers to be a club. *Miletus*. A rare gold stater, probably struck soon after the battle of *Magnesia*, B.C. 190.—R. Mowat. 'Martelage et

abrasion des monnaies sous l'empire romain; leurs contremaîtres.' The *memoriae damnatio* of the emperors takes effect on coins (though rarely) by the erasure of their names and portraits. The case of *Geta* is the best known and several Greek cities of the province of *Asia* erased his head on their local coins. A particularly bizarre effect is produced on coins where the heads of *Geta* and his brother have been originally represented side by side, and the head and titles of *Caracalla* alone continue visible. The inconvenience involved in a defacement of the currency is doubtless the cause why offending emperors were not 'erased' to the same extent as in the lapidary inscriptions and other public monuments. Mowat notes instances of the erasure of the name of *Sejanus* on coins of *Tiberius* struck at *Bilbilis* in Spain.

*Revue belge de Numismatique*. Part 1, 1902.

L. Renard describes a hoard of Roman coins (Sept. Severus to Postumus) discovered in 1883 at *Gives* (*Ben-Ahin*) in the province of *Liège*. A summary is added of finds of Roman coins found in the various provinces of Belgium.—A. de Witte publishes some terra-cotta moulds of coins of *Valentinian II*, *Gratian*, *Arcadius* and *Theodosius II* discovered in Egypt. Moulds of this kind have never been found in Italy: those found in France and Great Britain are chiefly of the third century A.D.

*Journal international d'archéologie numismatique* (Athens). Vol. iv. part 2, 1901.

Vlasto. 'Les monnaies d'or de Tarente.'—Mahler. 'Der Didymäische Apollo des Kanachos.'—Rouvier. 'Numismatique des villes de Phénicie: Dora, Enhudra, Marathos, Orthosia.'—Svoronos. 'Ερμηνεία τοῦ ἐξ Ἑλευσίνος μυστηριακοῦ πύρακος τῆς Νυμφίου.' Svoronos also writes (p. 153 f.) on the supposed gold 'coin' with hieroglyphics signifying 'good gold' and cites the opinions of *Maspero*, *Dattari*, and *Hill*. This strange piece is at present in the hands of an Armenian coin-dealer and I believe that most Museum authorities are of Mr. Hill's opinion that it is a modern fabrication. An important exception is M. Svoronos who, however, thinks that it is not a coin but an *exagium* used by money-changers for testing the weight of gold staters current in Egypt. But is there any other instance of a weight being made in gold? M. Dattari considers the piece to be authentic because of its provenance. According to his statement, it formed part of a hoard of *Philippi* and other gold staters found about 'six years ago by some Arabs working on the land of a Pacha.' The treasure was then divided, 'à ce que l'on dit,' into three, and was sold in the bazaar at *Cairo*. 'L'antiquaire A. D. qui acheta la pièce avec les hiéroglyphes me la montra tout de suite après l'avoir achetée.' All this is somewhat vague and it is not clear whether the statement that the 'exagium' formed part of the stater-find is made from hearsay or from M. Dattari's personal knowledge.

WARWICK WROTH.

<sup>4</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 28 Dec. 1901.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 21 Dec. 1901.



## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

**Journal of Philology.** Vol. 28. No. 55. 1901.

*Notes on the Ontology of the Philebus*, J. M. Schulhof. *Plato Theaetetus 179 e-180 a*, R. D. Archer-Hind. *Adversaria V.*, Robinson Ellis. *Hermas and Cebes*, C. Taylor. *Emendationes Homericae* (Ods. xvii-xix), T. L. Agar. *Lexicographical Notes*, E. W. Watson. *Hermas and Cebes—a reply*, St. George Stock. *Note on Hermas and Cebes—a reply*, C. Taylor. *Controversies in Armenian topography*, B. W. Henderson. *The Lex de Imperio Vespasiani*, F. B. R. Hellems. *Notes on Clement of Alexandria III*, H. Jackson. *Xenophon Cynegeticus xii. 6*, H. Jackson. *The date and origin of Pseudo-Anatolius De Ratione Paschali*, T. Nicklin. *Tibulliana*, J. P. Postgate. *Plutarch de Pythiae oraculis 25. 407 A*, H. Jackson.

**Hermathena** No. 27. 1901.

*Notes on Cicero Ad Atticum xiv*, J. S. Reid. *The Hellenic element in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, A. R. Eager. *Araxa on Cicero's Letters*, J. S. Reid. *Notes on the Annals of Tacitus*, L. C. Purser. *Fragment of a Greek Romance*, J. G. Smyly. An attempted restoration of text from a Papyrus acquired by Dr. Mahaffy at Medinet-el-Fayoum. *Two passages in Sophocles*, J. B. Bury. On *Antig. 3 foll. and O.C. 547*. *The Greek MSS. used by St. Jerome*, J. H. Bernard. *Horace, Ode iv. 4, and the Second Aeneid: some remarkable resemblances*, H. T. Johnstone. *Notes and emendations on Varro De Lingua Latina*, R. Ellis. *Latin verbs in -io with infinitives in -ere*, C. Exon. *Review of Ridgeway's Early Age of Greece*, G. Coffey.

**American Journal of Philology.** Vol. xxii, 1. Whole No. 85. 1901.

*A further collection of Latin proverbs*, M. C. Sutphen. *A study of the Leyden MS. of Nonius Marcellus*, W. M. Lindsay. *The 'Ipeia of Hellanicus and the burning of the Argive Heraeum*, B. Perrin. *Mutare Pulices*, K. F. Smith. A commentary on *Lucilius Non. 351*, M. The parentage of *Juvenal*, F. J. Marchant. *An Epic fragment from Oxyrhynchus*, G. M. Bolling. *Notes, Sophocles Ajax 143*, H. N. Sanders. H. C. Elmer reviews W. K. Clement's *Prohibitions in Silver Latin* and W. K. Clement replies.

Whole No. 86.

*A further collection of Latin proverbs*, M. C. Sutphen. *Aristotle's de Anima*, P. Shorey. *Some irregular forms of the Elegiac distich*, K. F. Smith. *Indian glosses in the Lexicon of Hesychios*, L. H. Gray and M. Schuyler, jr. K. F. Smith notices the new *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and J. J. Robinson Gradenwitz's *Einführung in die Papyruskunde*.

**Revue de Philologie.** Vol. 25, 4. Oct. 1901.

*Sur un nouvel édit de l'empereur Julien* (Fayûm Papyri), H. Dessau. The editors have hitherto attributed this edict to Alexander Severus. *Sur les manuscrits de Thucydide*, H. Stuart Jones. In reply to an art. of M. D. Serruy's in the last no. *Terentius Phormio*, L. Havet. Various notes on the text. *Terentiana*, Havet. 67-70, T. Kakridis. In 69, stops after *denique* not before. *Orphica*, Fr. 221, 227, 228, 254 Abel, P. Tannery. *Langue et style de Victor de Vita* (2nd art.), F. Ferrère. *Note sur une inscription de Trézène*, B. Haussoullier. *Le Miletien Lichas fils d'Hermophantos*, B. H. In the *Sitzungs-*

*berichte de l'Académie de Berlin* 1901, p. 903 sqq. the dedication in honour of Lichas of Miletus is to be attributed to the end of the third or beginning of the second century B.C.

**Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.** Vol. 56, 3. 1901.

*Coniectanea*, F. Buecheler. On *Plutarch (quaest. conviv.)*, *Martyrius de B et V grammaticum tractatum*, *Philoxenus, Capri orthographia* and *the Carmen de figuris*. *Zu griechischen Geographen*, R. Kunze. Corrections in the text of *Strabo* and *Steph. Byz.* from *Eustathii Comment. ad Dion. Perieg. Vindictiae Ovidianae* R. Helm. On *the Metamorphoses. Zu Arrians περί λους πόντου Εἰδήσεων*, F. Reuss. On the genuineness of this work, which is only found in *Cod. Palat. 398* in the form of a letter to *Hadrian*. The writer defends the genuineness of the second part against *Brandis*. *Zu Ovids Fasten Buch I und II*, R. Wuensch. Deals chiefly with the readings of *Cod. Ursinians* and the traces of a double recension. *Heron und seine Fachgenossen*, K. Tittel. (1) *Heron's Mechanik und Poseidonios*, (2) *Heron und Geminus*, (3) *Heron und Philon*. *De codice rescripto Parisino 7900 A*, H. Dessauer. This contains *Terence*, *Horace*, *Lucan*, *Juvenal*, and *Martianus Capella*. *Bronzeinschrift aus Liguris*, M. Fränkel. On a bronze slab in the *Berlin Museum* with the inscr. *Αρροφον ηερπουος αβεθεκων*. *Das Geschichtswerk des älteren Seneca*, R. Klotz. There is no ground for supposing that *Seneca* published or intended to publish his father's *historiae*. *Thukydides, Antiochos und die angebliche Biographie des Hermokrates* J. Steup. Does not agree with H. Stein's hypothesis in the last vol. of *Rh. Mus.* that *Thueyd.* is indebted to this supposed biography. *Zu den Scholien zu Germanici Aratea*, M. Manitius. *Das Alter des Codex Romanus Vergils*, E. Norden. *Πρωμνηστριος*, O. Hoffmann. Derives from *πρωμνηστος*. *Ὀνομα κη ἐπιταφίον*, F. Solmsen. An inscr. from *Tanagra*. *Zur Lex Manciana*, O. Seeck. A contradiction of A. Schulten in no. 1 of this vol. of *Rh. Mus.*

Part 4.

*Zu den Sintfluthsagen*, H. Usener. Gives additional matter to his work on the subject. *Wellhausen* has strengthened the view that the original kernel of the stories of the Flood was the setting forth of the birth of the god of light by the proof that the worshippers of *Jahveh* had this as the foundation. *Zwei Nominalbildungen auf -μα*, F. Sohnsen. The word *γράμμα* occurs in a dialect-inscr. from *Argos* and *ψάμμα* from *Crete*. *γράμμα* came from *γράφμα*. The suffix *μα* answers in Greek to the original suffix *men*, and must be presupposed in words like *παράδειγμα* = *παράδειγμα*. *Zu Tacitus*, F. Rühl. The judgment of *Tacitus* (*Ann. i. 62*) on the burial by *Germanicus* of those who fell in the *Varus*-fight is supported by the inscr. on a cenotaph of the optio *M. Caelius* (C. I. Rh. 209). Exx. are given of T.'s fondness for referring to the language of other authors. The opinion of *Seeck* that the two great historical works of *Tacitus* made up a whole of thirty books is considered unsound. *Das angebliche Testament Alexanders des Grossen*, A. Ausfeld. Brings new material for the elucidation of this subject. The testament is in *Ps.-Kall. iii. 33*. Next is given the letter of *Alexander* to the *Rhodians*, by which the testament was entrusted to them. The writer

concludes that the composition of the letter and of the testament dates from the flourishing period of Rhodes, the second half of the third century B.C., and that both were founded on a forgery belonging to the first decade after Alexander's death. *Die Porusschlacht*, C. Schubert. A new estimate of the sources. He shows that besides Ptolemy and Aristobulus, Arrian used other worthless authorities. It is not possible to give a general estimate of these sources, every piece of information must be tested. *Zu Avienus*, A. Breysig. A continuation from the last vol. *Nochmals die Bundesurkunde aus Argos*, A. Wilhelm. Defends his own restoration of C.I.G. 1118 as against Fränkel in no. 2 of this vol. of *Rh. Mus. Zu Corp. Inscr. Graec.* ii. 2555, P. Deiters. The remains of a treaty of union between two Cretan communities which is to be placed not long after 146 B.C. *Textkritisches zu Ciceros epistulae ad Quint. frat.*, L. Gurlitt. *Neues über Epikur und einige herkulanensische Rollen*, W. Crönert. Claims that a number of these rolls contain fragments of Epicurus, and describes some other papyri which contain fragments of Philodemus. *Ἡρόδοτος Σουλίου*, H. Stein. These words cannot have been the beginning of the history. *Das Geburtsjahr des Marcus Brutus*, O. Seeck. Agrees with Vell. Pat. in placing this 78 B.C. *Mummius Achaicus und die Lex Varia*, F. Ruehl. *Bentley's Noten zu Suetons Schrift de grammaticis et rhetoribus*, M. Ihm. *Zum Nom. sg. semifer und vir*, F. Sommer. *Etruskische Monatsnamen und Zahlwörter*, F. Skutsch. *Zu den Abendmählern*, A. Klotz. Ammianus quoted to show that these are magic-formulae as maintained by Dieterich. *Zur Vasengeschichte*, H. Usener. U. brings forward two formulae which were intended to purify for Christian use vases taken from heathen graves.

**Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, etc.** Vol. 7, 6/7. 1901.

*Verschollene Sagen und Kulte auf griechischen und italischen Bildwerken*, O. Rossbach. Gives many ex. from vases and coins of legends that have perished. B. Gerth reviews together Riemann and Goelzer's *Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin* and Gildersleeve's *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*, Part I. K. Lehmann shows on what grounds the spot in the neighbourhood of Berry-au-Bac assumed by Göler and Napoleon (Stoffel) as the site of the battle on the Axona (*Caes. B.G.* ii. 5-12) is inadmissible, and points out what requirements any assumed site must satisfy. The number of troops of the United Belgae is put much too high at 360,000, which is after all only the information of the Remi.

**Part 8.**

*Der Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, S. Reiter. Relates the early history of attempts to produce this work down to the undertaking in 1894. *Die Entstehung der Ciceronischen Briefsammlungen*, L. Gurlitt. Tiro began to collect in 46 B.C. and published all that was available to him. The letters previous to 58 B.C. did not belong to this number for they were involved in the destruction of Cicero's house in this year, except a few which were to be found in the hands of the addressees. There is no reason for thinking that C. or Tiro corrected the letters for publication, nor did Tiro intentionally separate consecutive letters or change the chronological order. *Aus der Geschichte der Astrologie*, W. Kroll. Seeks to find the source from which Ptolemy and the other writers of the Empire created their astrological system. All depend on the Babylonians, the inventors of the science, and the quotations point to

an alleged work of Nechepso and Petosiris, which existed at Alexandria probably between 170 and 100 B.C. and became the foundation for all later astrology. F. Koepp reviews Bury's *History of Greece*.

**Part 9.**

*Zur Eröffnung des XLVI. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Strassburg i.E.* (1 Oct. 1901), E. Schwartz. In an opening address shows how modern philology has far outgrown its earlier limits of classicism. *Pasquino, Schicksale einer antiken Marmorygruppe*, O. Waser. This fragment, dug out about 1500, was decorated with verses which in time became satirical, mostly in Italian. The mutilated group depicts Menelaus with the body of Patroclus and is perhaps a predecessor of the Laocoon group. *Flugschriften aus der Zeit des ersten Triumvirats*, O. E. Schmidt. The *circuli* or political clubs provided the soil for the growth of the numerous political pamphlets of this time. To them belong the speeches in *Clodium et Curionem* of the summer of 61 whose illicit publication in 58 did so much harm to Cicero; both the commentaries on his consulship in Latin and Greek prose in 60; Varro's *Trupdpaves* directed against the Triumvirs; the edicts of Bibulus against Caesar early in 59; Caesar's replies to the speeches of C. Memmius and especially after the (probable) perjury of L. Veturius against Pompeius to which Curio retorted with his *dialogus in Caesarem*. Curio's speeches were also of this nature. To him and to Cicero these writings had far more serious results than to Varro, Catullus, Bibaculus, and others who had no influence in political life. *Horaz als Darwinist*, M. Schneidewin. In *Epp.* ii. 2. 213 *vivere si recte nescis, decede peritis* the reference is not, as Orelli and Krüger take it, to physical death, but to spiritual and social death as the result of ignorance of the art of living. *Platons Euthydemus*, E. R. Gast. Shows the connexion between the Euthydemus and the Protagoras. Both dialogues handle the question, what is the value of knowledge and how we proceed through *σοφία* to *ἀρετή*. They form an amusing introduction to a more serious treatment.

**Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.** 1901.

23 Oct. W. Strehl, *Grundriss der alten Geschichte und Quellenkunde*. I. *Griechische Geschichte*. 2. Ausgabe von P. Habel. II. *Römische Geschichte* (A. Höck), favourable. C. Robert, *Studien zur Ilias*. Mit Beiträgen von F. Bechtel (Hoerenz). Concluded. 'Shows extraordinary acuteness and accuracy.' *Omero, L' Iliade comment*, da O. Zuretti. III. L. ix-xii (C. Rothe), favourable. J. Moeller, *Studia Mamiliana* (Breiter). 'A diligent and learned study.' *Taciti opera minora*, rec. H. Furneaux (Ed. Wolff). 'Shews sound judgement and sagacious use of recent researches.'

30 Oct. W. v. Landau, *Die Phönizier* (A. Höck), favourable. E. Weissenborn, *Leben und Sitten bei Homer* (G. Vogrinz). 'Good on the whole but weak in mythology.' Th. Wetzel, *Untersuchungen zum 16. Buch der Ilias* (C. Rothe). *Ciceronis epistulae*. I. *Ad familiares*, rec. C. Purser (W. Sternkopf), favourable. P. Giles, *A Short Manual of Comparative Philology*. 2 ed. (H. Ziemer), very favourable.

6 Nov. N. Wecklein, *Platonische Studien* (A. Döring). On the Crito, and on the relation of the Platonic Symposium to the Xenophontean. 'Not convincing.' W. Soltan, *Unsere Evangelien* (E. Rodenbusch), favourable. P. Rasi, *Di un pentametro controverso nella regina elegiarum* (K. P. Schulze). Defends the MSS. reading in Prop. iv. 11, 66 *consule*

*quo facto tempore rapta soror.* Augustini de civitate Dei libri xxii ex rec. E. Hoffmann (G. Pfeilschifter). 'Deserves all recognition, but cannot be considered definitive.' F. F. Abbott, *The use of repetition in Latin* (H. Ziemer). 'Too much attempted in a few pages.'

13 Nov. H. Die's, *Herakleitos von Ephesos* (A. Döring). Makes a great advance on Bywater's 'Reliquiae.' Guil. Vollgraff, *De Ovidii mythopoeia* (J. Tolkiehn), unfavourable. G. Lazić, *De Ciceronis librorum de legibus temporis et libris primi compositione* (Hoyer), unfavourable. F. Boscaino, *Note epigrafiche* (v. Domaszewski), unfavourable. W. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im Römischen Kaiserreiche* (E. Kornemann). 'A great collection of materials.'

20 Nov. F. v. Reber und A. Bayersdorfer *Klassischer Skulpturenschatz* iv. 6-24. (W. Amelung), very favourable. J. Bernoulli, *Griechische Ikonographie* i. (G. Körte), favourable. *Xenophontis Hippiarchicus*, rec. P. Cerochi (W. Gemoll), favourable. G. Grasso, *Studi di geografia classica e di topografia storica*. 3 fasc. (R. Oehler). 'Shows much critical skill.' Giov. Oberziner, *Origine della plebe romana* (A. Höck). 'Comprehensive and thorough study.' P. Rasi, *Postille Virgiliane* (K. P. Schulze). On four passages in the Eclogues. H. Wölitz, *Das pseudotullianische Gedicht Adversus Marcionem* (G. Pfeilschifter), favourable.

27 Nov. R. Menge, *Einführung in die antike Kunst*. 3. A. (R. Oehler), very favourable. W. Belck, *Beiträge zur alten Geographie und Geschichte Vorderasiens*. I. (V. Präsek), favourable. *Herodotos*, ed. von H. Stein. I, 1 (1. Buch) 6. A. (W. Gemoll), very favourable. W. Nestle, *Euripides, der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung* (M. Schneidewin). 'Ought to be in the library of every gymnasium.' W. Volkman, *Eine Annäherung zur Technik des Ovid* (O. Güthling), favourable.

4 Dec. M. Conbruehl, *Zur Überlieferung von Hephästions ἑρμηνείων περί μέτρων* (C. Haeblerin). 'Deserves all recognition.' Horatius' Oden und Epoden, ed. von A. Kiessling, 4. A. von R. Heinze (O. Weissenfels). 'Up to the level of our present knowledge.' L. Maccari, *Osservazioni ad Orazio. Primo saggio* (K. P. Schulze), favourable. Virgil, *The Aeneid*, Books vii.-xii., by T. E. Page (H. W.), favourable. S. Rubin, *Die Ethik Senecas in ihrem Verhältniss zur älteren und mittleren Stoa* (E. Badstübner), favourable. R. Horton-Smith, *The theory of conditional sentences in Greek and Latin* (O. Weissenfels), unfavourable. W. Weinberger, *Studien zur Handschriftenkunde* (C. Haeblerin), favourable.

11 Dec. G. Dakyns, *The march of the ten thousand*, being a translation of the *Anabasis* (O. Güthling), favourable. G. v. Wartensleben, *Begriff der griechischen Chreia* (C. Haeblerin), favourable. M. Wegscheider, *Geburts-hilfe und Gynäkologie bei Aetios von Amida*, favourable on the whole. *Properti carmina*, ed. J. Phillimore (K. P. Schulze), favourable.

18 Dec. W. Gemoll, *Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis, Hellenika, und Memorabilien* (W. Vollbrecht). 'A very admirable production.' Cicero *De Oratore, Brutus, Orator*. Antologia dal M. Nicolini (O. Weissenfels), very favourable. Fr. Haussen, *Zur lateinischen und romanischen Metrik* (H. Draheim). 'Thorough and judicious.' Chr. Muff, *Humanistische und realistische Bildung* (G. Schneider). 'Deserves the serious consideration of all educated people.'

25 Dec. B. L. Gildersleeve, *Syntax of classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*, First part (J. Sitzler), very favourable. Cicero, *Pro Archia*, ed. by G. H. Nall, favourable. G. N. Olcott, *Studies in the word-formation of the Latin inscriptions, substantives and*

*adjectives* (W. Heraeus). 'An excellent contribution to our knowledge of the vulgar Latin.' G. Ferrara, *Di alcune pretese irregolarità nella metrica dei melodi bizantini* (H. G.), favourable.

1902.

1 Jan. A. Baumgartner, *Geschichte der Welt-literatur*. I. *Die Literaturen Westasiens und der Nilländer* 3. and 4. A. (L. Feder), very favourable. H. Francotte, *La législation athénienne sur les distinctions honorifiques* (O. Schulthess). 'Fuli of learning.' P. Giardelli, *Note di critica Plautina* (P. Trautwein), favourable. J. Curschmann, *Zur Inversion der römischen Eigennamen*. I. *Cicero bis Livius* (R. Macke), very favourable. A. Gruber, *Studien zu Pacianus von Barcelona* (G. Pfeilschifter), favourable.

8 Jan. *Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques*, par R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier, Th. Reinach. II. 1 (O. Schulthess). 'Deserves the warmest reception.' H. Jackson, *Text to illustrate a course of elementary lectures on the history of Greek philosophy from Thales to Aristotle*. (A. Döring), favourable on the whole. E. Samter, *Familienfeste der Griechen und Römer* (P. Stengel), favourable. O. Richter, *Topographie der Stadt Rom*. 2. A. (D. Detlefsen), favourable.

15. Jan. *Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde*, herausg. von C. Wessely. I. (W. Crönert), very favourable. Fr. Graf zu Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg, *Reisebilder aus Sizilien und Korfu* (E. Wolff), favourable. F. Hitzig, *Iniuria* (B. Kübler). 'A comparative study in law in the best sense of the word.' *Caesaris opera*. II. *Commentarii de bell. civ. cum libris de bell. Alexandrino Africano Hispaniensi*, rec. R. du Pontet (E. Wolff). 'Makes no important advance in the study of Caesar.' F. F. Abbott, *A history and description of Roman political institutions* (G. v. Köbelski), favourable. F. N. Finck, *Die Klassifikation der Sprachen* (O. Weissenfels), unfavourable.

22 Jan. H. Reinhold, *De Graecitate Patrum Apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum Novi Testamenti quaestiones grammaticae* (A. Deissman), favourable. J. Kubik, *Realerklärung und Anschauungsunterricht bei der Lektüre des Sallust und des Bellum civile Cäsars* (Th. Opitz), favourable. F. Knoke, *Das Schlachtfeld im Teutoburger Walde—Das Varuslager bei Iburg—Die römischen Forschungen im nordwestlichen Deutschland—Eine Eisenschmelze im Habichtswalde bei Stift Leeden—Ein Urteil über das Varuslager im Habichtswalde* (E. Wolff). A series of polemical writings against A. Wilms and others. H. C. Newton, *The epigraphical evidence for the reign of Vespasian and Titus* (v. Domaszewski), unfavourable. W. M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' dictionary of republican Latin* (O. Froehde). 'Its study arouses much interest.'

29 Jan. K. Schirlitz, *Der Beweis für die Identität der Tapferkeit und des Wissens in Platons Protagoras* (Karlowa). 'Thorough and acute.' F. Heerdegen, *Über parenthetische Sätze und Satzverbindungen in der Kranzrede des Demosthenes* (C. Hammer), favourable. J. Schmidt, *Schülerkommentar zu Cäsars Denkwürdigkeiten über den gallischen Krieg*. 3. A. (A. Reckzey), favourable. R. Novak, *In Panegyricos Latinos studia grammatica et critica* (R. Helm). 'An excellent critical work.' K. Reisinger, *Über Bedeutung und Verwendung der Präpositionen ob und propter*. II (E. Wolff). O. Krell, *Altromische Heizungen* (C. Koenen). From the technical point of view of an engineer.

5 Feb. W. Reichel, *Homeriche Waffen*. 2. A. (A. Körte). 'Very valuable.' Cicero, *Select Orationes*, ed. by B. L. D'Ooge (W. Hirschfelder), very

favourable. A. Heisenberg, *Analekta. Mitteilungen aus italienischen Handschriften byzantinischer Chronographen* (G. Wartenberg). 'Opening the way for future investigation.'

12. Feb. *The Amherst Papyri*, by B. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. II (C. Wessely). 'A publication that does honour to the Oxford University Press.' R. Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen nach ungedruckten griechischen Texten der Strassburger Bibliothek* (H. Steding), favourable. S. Eitrem, *Zur Iliad-Analyse. Die Aussöhnung* (Hoerenz). A. Morshead, *The house of Atreus, being the Agamemnon, Libation-Bearers, and Furies of Aeschylus translated into English verse* (H. Draheim), favourable. Cornelio Tacito, *Gli Annali*, comment. da V. Menghini. II, libro III (E. Wolff), favourable. N. G. Politis, 'Ελληνες ἡ Ρωμαῖοι' (G. Wartenberg).

**Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik.** Vol. xii, 2. 1901.

*Das Defectivum 'odi' und sein Ersatz*, G. Landgraf. Shows why the original verb 'odire' was not used and how the want of it was made up. *Sprachliches zum Bellum Hispaniense*, E. Wölfflin. In the Ashburnhamensis we find the title lib. xiii de bello hispanico. Hence it is probable that books I and II of *Bellum civile* formed originally only one book. Some critical notes follow. *Paricida*, E. Wölfflin. Lunák's meaning 'qui caedem parat' suits the sense but not the form. *Zu Caecilius Aurelianus*, G. Helmreich. Proves that the editio princeps (1529) in many places gives a better text than the Leyden (1567). *Pullus 'Hahn'*, J. Cornu. In the peregrinatio ad loca sancta we find pullus constantly used for gallus. *Die neue Epitoma Alexandri*, E. Wölfflin. *Grammatisch-lexikalische Notizen*, F. Skutsch. Notes on the following words *Necesse*, *Caepetum*, *Jubatus*, *Luercupidinem* atque *accipitrem pecuniae* (from Plautus not from Plato as quoted in Apuleius), *Accipetrina*, *Alienus laniena*, *Meridie*, *Emera* (=to take), *Septembri*—to *Decembri*—, *Magnanimus*. The presents in -io, *Apprimus* and kindred words. *Zur Phraseologie der lateinischen Grabinschriften*, J. E. Church junr. I. The forms with *situs*. II. The forms with *quiesco*. *Zur Geschichte der Pronomina demonstrativa*. II., Meader-Wölfflin. I. hic...ille. 2. hic...hic. 3. ille...ille. *Die römische Soldaten-*

*sprache*, W. Heraeus. An exposition of Kempf's treatise 'Romanorum sermonis castrensis reliquiae collectae et illustratae.' *Fufidius*, E. Wölfflin. This is to be read in Cic. vii. 5. 2 for the corrupt *Iliviu*. *Ampla*, O. Hey. = *ansa* in the Rufinus transl. of Adamantius. *Conquinisco, conquezi*, E. Wölfflin. In the Epit. Alexandri (Wagner) §101 *conquezit* must be read *conquevit*. *Die Endung—por* in *Gaipor, Lucipor*, etc. A. Zimmermann. *Hibus dans TERENCE*, L. Havet. Must be read for the second *illis* in Phorm. 332. *Cathedra*, J. Cornu. In Juv. vi. 90 foll. *molles cathedras*=mulieres delicatiores. *Die Captivi des Plautus*, W. Christ. Rightly referred by Lindsay to an original by Possidippus. Perhaps P. brought out the Αἰχμάλωτοι for the new town of Pleuron rebuilt about 235 B.C. *Zu den Donatscholien*, P. Wessner. The words *deturpo, infructifer, similitudinarius, specioso* are found in interpolations. *Causator*, G. Landgraf.=accusator in Schol. Gronovianus to Cic. *Rosc. Am.* § 51.

**Mnemosyne.** Vol. 30, 1. 1902.

**ΝΑΡΔΟΣ ΠΙΣΤΙΚΗ**, S. A. Naber. For νάρδου πιστικής in S. Mark xiv. 3, S. John xii. 2, proposes νάρδου σπειστικής i.e. *liquidac*. *Emendatur Aristotelis περί ἑρμηνείας* c. X §5, I.C.V. Reads αὐταὶ μὲν σύνδου (for οὐν δύο) ἀντίκεινται ἀλλήλοις. *Thucydidea* (continued), I. C. Vollgraff. Notes on Book iv. with reference to Hude's edition. *Aristophanea*, H. van Herwerden. Notes on the Acharnians, Knights, and Clouds with a few on the Frogs. **ΟΙΣΟΜΕΝ—ΘΗΣΟΜΕΝ**, H. v. H. Substitutes *θήσομεν* for *οἰσομεν* in Plat. Rep. 477 E. *De Argonautarum vellere aureo*, J. Vürtheim. After disposing of the view that *vellus*=*nubes*, V. maintains that the intended sacrifice of *Phrixus* (=φρίξ *mare agilatum*) was a sacrifice by the Minyae, a maritime people, to the sea, and that the victim was wrapped in the fleece of a ram, since its curly appearance presented the image of the sea curled by the wind. *Ad Plutarchum*, J. J. Hartman. In Lyc. 12 reads τὸν διακόνου φέροντος ἀγγεῖον ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔβαλλε. *Ad Aristophanis Aves* (continued), J. van Leeuwen J. f. Various notes. *Tacitea*, J. J. Hartman. Fortifies with further examples the opinion of E. Wölfflin that in the lives of Galba and Otho Plutarch followed Tacitus.